
INTERNATIONAL REVIEW

OF THE RED CROSS



Published every two months by the
International Committee of the Red Cross
for the International Red Cross
and Red Crescent Movement



INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

- Mr. CORNELIO SOMMARUGA, Doctor of Laws of Zurich University, Doctor h.c. *rer. pol.* of Fribourg University (Switzerland), Doctor h.c. in International Relations of Minho University, Braga (Portugal), Doctor h.c. of Medicine of Bologna University (Italy), Doctor h.c. of Nice-Sophia Antipolis University, *President* (member since 1986)
- Mr. PIERRE KELLER, Doctor of Philosophy in International Relations (Yale), banker, *Vice-President* (1984)
- Mr. CLAUDIO CARATSCH, Bachelor of Arts, *Vice-President* (1990)
- Mr. ULRICH MIDDENDORP, Doctor of Medicine, head of surgical department of the Cantonal Hospital, Winterthur (1973)
- Mr. MAURICE AUBERT, Doctor of Laws, Vice-President from 1984 to 1991 (1979)
- Mr. RUDOLF JÄCKLI, Doctor of Sciences (1979)
- Mr. DIETRICH SCHINDLER, Doctor of Laws, Professor at the University of Zurich (1961-1973) (1980)
- Mrs. RENÉE GUISAN, General Secretary of the International "Institut de la Vie", Head of medico-social institutions in the Canton of Vaud, member of the International Association for Volunteer Effort (1986)
- Mrs. ANNE PETITPIERRE, Doctor of Laws, barrister, lecturer at Geneva Law Faculty (1987)
- Mr. PAOLO BERNASCONI, Barrister, LL. L., lecturer in economic penal law at the Universities of St. Gallen and Zurich, former Public Prosecutor at Lugano, member of the Swiss *Pro Juventute* Foundation (1987)
- Mrs. LISELOTTE KRAUS-GURNY, Doctor of Laws of Zurich University (1988)
- Mrs. SUSY BRUSCHWEILER, nurse, Director of the Bois-Cerf Nursing School in Lausanne and professor at the College of Nursing in Aarau, President of the Swiss Association of Nursing School Directors (1988)
- Mr. JACQUES FORSTER, Doctor of Economics, Director of the Institute of Development Studies in Geneva (1988)
- Mr. PIERRE LANGUETIN, Master of Economics and Social Studies, Doctor h.c. of the University of Lausanne, former President of the Governing Board of the Swiss National Bank (1988)
- Mr. JACQUES MOREILLON, Bachelor of Laws, Doctor of Political Science, Secretary General of the World Organization of the Scout Movement, former Director General at the ICRC (1988)
- Mr. MAX DAETWYLER, graduate in Economics and Social Sciences of the University of Geneva, Scholar in Residence of the International Management Institute (IMI) of Geneva (1989)
- Mr. MARCO MUMENTHALER, Doctor of Medicine, Professor of Neurology and Rector of the University of Berne (1989)
- Mr. RODOLPHE DE HALLER, M. D., former lecturer at the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Geneva, President of the Swiss Association against Tuberculosis and Lung Diseases (1991)
- Mr. DANIEL THURER, LL.M. (Cambridge) LL. D., professor at the University of Zurich (1991)
- Ms. FRANCESCA POMETTA, Bachelor of Arts, former Swiss Ambassador (1991)

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Mr. CORNELIO SOMMARUGA, *President*

Mr. CLAUDIO CARATSCH, *permanent Vice-President*

Mr. JACQUES FORSTER, *member of the ICRC*

Mrs. ANNE PETITPIERRE, *member of the ICRC*

Mr. PETER FUCHS, *Director General*

Mr. JEAN DE COURTEN, *Director of Operations*

Mr. YVES SANDOZ, *Director for Principles, Law
and Relations with the Movement*

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF THE RED CROSS

CONTENTS

JULY-AUGUST 1992
No. 289

MORE ABOUT THE EMBLEM

- Unity and plurality of the emblems*, by the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross 333
- Regulations on the use of the emblem of the red cross or the red crescent by the National Societies**, adopted by the 20th International Conference (Vienna, 1965) and revised by the Council of Delegates (Budapest, 1991) 339

HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

- Frédéric Maurice†**: "Humanitarian ambition" 363
- Cornelio Sommaruga**: Assistance to victims of war in international humanitarian law and humanitarian practice 373

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE MEDAL

- Regulations for the Florence Nightingale Medal**, amended text adopted by the Council of Delegates (Budapest, 1991) 383
- 329

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

Missions by the President	387
Meeting on aid for victims of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia (Geneva, 29 July 1992)	389

IN THE RED CROSS AND RED CRESCENT WORLD

EUROPEAN REGIONAL CONFERENCE

<i>“The new Europe needs the new Red Cross”</i> (The Hague, 18-22 May 1992)	391
---	------------

COLUMBUS '92 EXHIBITION

<i>The ICRC and the Italian Red Cross in Genoa</i>	393
---	------------

Recognition of new National Societies

● Seychelles Red Cross	396
● The Red Cross of the Russian Federation	396
Joint Commission of the Empress Shōken Fund — Seventy-first distribution of income	397

MISCELLANEOUS

Russian Federation signs headquarters agreement with ICRC	401
Declaration by the Republic of Seychelles	401
The Portuguese Republic ratifies the Protocols	402
Declaration of the Standing Commission of the Red Cross and Red Crescent	402

BOOKS AND REVIEWS

Publications received	404
Addresses of National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies	407

ARTICLES SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION IN THE *INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF THE RED CROSS*

The *International Review of the Red Cross* invites readers to submit articles relating to the various humanitarian concerns of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. These will be considered for publication on the basis of merit and relevance to the topics to be covered during the year.

- Manuscripts will be accepted in *English, French, Spanish, Arabic or German*.

Texts should be typed, double-spaced, and no longer than 20 pages (or 4 000 words). Please send diskettes if possible (*Word-perfect 5.1 preferred*).

- Footnotes (*no more than 30*) should be numbered superscript in the main text. They should be typed, double-spaced, and grouped at the end of the article.
- Bibliographical references should include at least the following details: (a) for books, the author's initials and surname (in that order), book title (underlined), place of publication, publishers and year of publication (in that order), and page number(s) referred to (p. or pp.); (b) for articles, the author's initials and surname, article title in inverted commas, title of periodical (underlined), place of publication, periodical date, volume and issue number, and page number(s) referred to (p. or pp.). The titles of articles, books and periodicals should be given in the original language of publication.
- Unpublished manuscripts will not be returned.
- Published works sent to the editor will be mentioned in the list of publications received and, if considered appropriate, reviewed.
- Manuscripts, correspondence and requests for permission to reproduce texts appearing in the *Review* should be addressed to the editor.

Articles, studies, and other signed texts from non-ICRC sources published in the *Review* reflect the views of the author alone and not necessarily those of the ICRC.

COMPLETE YOUR COLLECTION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF THE RED CROSS

Out of print: No. 1 (April 1961); No. 9 (December 1961); No. 11 (February 1962); No. 13 (April 1962) to No. 17 (August 1962); No. 20 (November 1962) to No. 24 (March 1963); No. 26 (May 1963); No. 27 (June 1963); No. 29 (August 1963); No. 31 (October 1963) to No. 43 (November 1964); No. 52 (July 1965) to No. 54 (September 1965); No. 58 (January 1966) to No. 83 (February 1968); No. 86 (May 1968); No. 91 (October 1968); No. 93 (December 1968); No. 94 (January 1969); No. 96 (March 1969); No. 98 (May 1969) to No. 103 (October 1969); No. 105 (December 1969) to No. 108 (March 1970); No. 113 (August 1970); No. 114 (September 1970); No. 119 (February 1971); No. 122 (May 1971); No. 124 (July 1971); No. 128 (November 1971) to No. 130 (January 1972); No. 137 (August 1972); No. 139 (October 1972); No. 142 (January 1973) to No. 145 (April 1973); No. 148 (July 1973) to No. 158 (May 1974); No. 161 (August 1974); No. 169 (April 1975); No. 172 (June 1975); No. 174 (September 1975) to No. 177 (December 1975); No. 181 (April 1976); No. 185 (August 1976); No. 186 (September 1976); No. 188 (November 1976) to No. 202 (January-February 1978); No. 205 (July-August 1978); No. 207 (November-December 1978); No. 213 (November-December 1979) to No. 215 (March-April 1980); No. 217 (July-August 1980); No. 218 (September-October 1980); No. 220 (January-February 1981); No. 229 (July-August 1982); No. 231 (November-December 1982); No. 265 (July-August 1988); No. 284 (September-October 1991).

All other issues are available for 1 Sw. fr. per copy (plus postage).

*Orders may be sent to the International Review of the Red Cross,
19 Avenue de la Paix, CH-1202 Geneva.*

Unity and plurality of the emblems

The armed conflicts which are causing bloodshed in a number of regions of the world have led special emphasis to be laid on one of the fundamental problems of humanitarian action in times of war: how to ensure respect for emblems providing protection for the victims of violence and for those who come to their assistance.

In 1864, the Geneva Conventions established a distinctive uniform sign for the armed forces' medical services as a means of improving the protection of wounded soldiers and members of medical services. Nearly one hundred and thirty years later, the protective value of the emblem of the Conventions has been vitiated by two factors; abuses of the emblem, and its plurality.

The loss of human lives and the unnecessary suffering resulting from this situation are a matter of primary concern for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, one of whose major challenges is that of securing absolute respect for the emblems. Opinions regarding the symbolic scope of the red cross and red crescent emblems should give way to concern for strengthening their protective value, since the protective system established by international humanitarian law would lose much of its substance in the absence of respect for the emblem and of the conditions governing its use. The particular aspect of these problems which is examined below is that of the unity and plurality of the emblems.

In recent years, problems related to the red cross and the red crescent emblems and the religious connotations attached to them have arisen from time to time in various countries of different continents. In particular, the emergence of new National Societies faced with difficulties in choosing an emblem has raised problems for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. Some ten years after the decision by the Council of Delegates in Manila in 1981 to dissolve the Working Group on the Emblem, it must be admitted that the problems which led to that group being formed have still not been solved and that events since then call for further consideration of the matter. It is important to analyse here the reasons why the present situation

is unsatisfactory and to list the conditions that any realistic solution should fulfil.

The objective of unity of the distinctive sign, which symbolizes selfless help for all who suffer, is a corollary of the basic ideals of the Movement. The use of the same emblem by the medical services of various parties to a conflict emphasizes the basic values which must remain common to the adversaries: humanity towards all the victims, neutrality of those who come to their assistance and impartiality of the aid provided. It is a confirmation of the unity of human civilizations with respect to certain standards of behaviour. The expansion of the Movement to embrace practically all cultures, religions and nationalities, its persuasion of most of the States of the world increasingly to extend the protection offered by international humanitarian law to the victims of armed conflicts and the fact that it also comes to the assistance of populations stricken by natural disasters, by accidents or disease all endorse the original justification of a single emblem.

The rule of the unity of the emblem laid down in Article 7 of the 1864 Geneva Conventions was broken during the Balkan War of 1876-1878, when the Ottoman Empire informed the depositary of the Convention that, while respecting the red cross emblem as protecting enemy ambulances, it would henceforth adopt the sign of a red crescent on a white ground¹ for the protection of its own ambulances. Since then, over 25 States with Muslim majorities have also adopted the red crescent emblem.

The attitude of the ICRC has been consistent in this regard: it has warned against the dangers inherent in the fragmentation of the protective sign whereby the red crescent, which was the national and religious sign of the Ottoman Empire, was placed in antithesis to the red cross, which Muslims regarded as a religious emblem.

In 1981, in his address as President of the ICRC to the International Conference in Manila, the late President Hay stressed that "*The emblem worn by each of us is not the privilege of any one State, people or religion, but a sign of respect for wounded and defenceless victims and a token of solidarity with human beings in distress*".

Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the historical events which led to the choice of the red cross as the protective emblem and then to the admission of the red crescent: the intrinsic value of the two emblems cannot be placed in question, any more than can the profound faith that millions of human beings have in them. Yet the coexistence of the

¹ See *The Emblem of the Red Cross. A Brief History*, by F. Bugnion, ICRC, 1977.

two emblems has had the effect of accentuating their religious connotation in public opinion, for there can be no doubt that this identification with a religious group has to some extent affected the victims of conflicts in which each of the adversaries uses a different emblem. As we have already said, "*the emblem derives its protective value from the fact that the same sign is used by friend and foe*",² and if the emblem loses its neutrality, there is a great danger of its becoming a target.

The ICRC's experience of conflicts in the latter part of the twentieth century has made it very much aware of the possible weakening of the protective value of the emblem to the detriment of the victims. Moreover identification, though erroneously, of the authorized emblems with two of the great monotheistic religions is *hardly compatible with the principle of universality*, since it can give the impression of favouring Christianity and Islam at the expense of other religions, such as Judaism, Hinduism or Buddhism, and other schools of thought of a religious or secular nature. This also detracts from the credibility of the emblem in the eyes of those who rightly attach no religious connotation to it, for although the individuals composing the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement often derive their humanitarian motivation from faith, the emblem should above all symbolize the unity of their inspiration and of their striving towards a single goal. Yet the reservation that members of the Movement must observe in their humanitarian activities with respect to the various religions, or even to religion in general, in no way curbs their individual freedom in spiritual matters.

In the public view the unity of the Movement should be reflected in a single emblem. Instead, the plurality of signs gives evidence of division and of an inability to overcome certain divergences and to transcend religious or cultural differences: the Movement has thus failed in an area in which other universal organizations, particularly United Nations agencies, have succeeded.

Nor has the Movement achieved the universality which it has established as one of its Fundamental Principles, and this partly for reasons connected with the existing emblems. The populations of certain countries and the members of certain Societies feel that they cannot identify with the emblem of the red cross or the red crescent: that is why, for example, the Red Shield of David Society (the "Magen David Adom" in Israel), which renders valuable humanitarian

² See François Bugnion, "The red cross and crescent emblems", *IRRC*, No 272, September-October 1989, p. 418.

service in a troubled part of the world, cannot formally belong to the Movement since it considers itself unable to adopt either of the present emblems. Other National Societies have in the past applied for the recognition of various emblems corresponding to their particular religious, philosophical or ethnic aspirations, but have subsequently withdrawn their requests.

The position of certain Red Cross or Red Crescent Societies in countries populated by different religious communities is now arousing serious concern. One part of the population identifies itself with one emblem and another with the other, thus creating a division in the National Society. Such antagonisms can be detrimental to the recruitment of volunteers and to the credibility of the Society. In cases of international conflict, when the cohesion of a National Society is most sorely tried, the fragmentation of local branches adopting one or the other emblem might well destroy the protective value of the distinctive sign. A National Society might thus be paralysed by such division at the very time when its action is most needed.

Attention must also be drawn to the danger of the proliferation of emblems that is inherent in the existence of two emblems each identified with a particular religion. When such connotations become fixed in the mind, requests for the recognition of other emblems are bound to arise, although every increase in the number of emblems would have the effect of diminishing their protective value. In the worst case, partisan emblems would become targets. Accordingly, the adoption of one or more new signs with a specific connotation, which would be valid only in one country or in a small number of countries, would contribute to dividing the Movement and weakening the protective value of the emblem.

At the present time, there is no easy solution for these problems. The inability of the Movement's Working Group, which was disbanded in 1981, to formulate any acceptable proposals testifies to the numerous difficulties encountered in any search for a solution. Nevertheless, the Movement cannot evade the challenge. It must do its utmost to meet and overcome it, in accordance with the principle of humanity, which calls upon it to promote mutual understanding and friendship between peoples, and the principle of universality, under which the Movement must be open to all. To prevent the political, religious and ideological differences which divide the modern world from becoming breaking points fraught with the danger of new conflicts, the Movement is duty bound to demonstrate a cohesion at the humanitarian level which should also be reflected in the way it tackles the question of the emblem. Over and above the specific prob-

lems created by the religious connotation ascribed by some to the emblems of the red cross and red crescent—problems which are all the more important because in times of conflicts or unrest human lives depend on respect for these emblems—the challenge set is that of the very coexistence of different cultural and religious communities.

The ICRC therefore considers that the question should be re-examined, and wishes to contribute openly to such a re-examination. The search for a solution, whatever it may be, will have to meet four requirements whose pertinence has been demonstrated by experience within the Movement:

- *the solution must be very widely acceptable;*
- *the States and National Societies which use one of the recognized signs must not be forced to renounce or change their emblem unless they wish to do so;*
- *any new sign must be graphically simple enough to ensure good visibility at a distance, must be devoid of any religious, political, ethnic or other connotation, and must be made widely known in peacetime so that it is easily identified by those who are required to respect it;*
- *any proliferation of emblems, which would not fail to occur if too much freedom of choice is allowed, must be avoided.*

If a new search is to be undertaken, it must be realistic from the start as regards two points. First of all, a return to the red cross as the only emblem, which the ICRC had long wished for, can no longer be contemplated; it is equally inconceivable that all the components of the Movement would agree to abandon the existing emblems, to which millions of people are deeply attached.

Also, the use of the red cross and red crescent emblems in juxtaposition (which is contrary to existing law, since Article 38 of the First Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 provides for the use of the red crescent *instead* of the red cross, not side by side with it) would certainly have serious disadvantages: the religious connotation of the two signs would be emphasized; generalized use of the double emblem would also have the unfortunate result of precluding any solution for Societies which are unable to accept either the red cross or the red crescent; and intermittent requests for the recognition of new signs would continue to be received. Furthermore, numerous tests have shown that the visibility at a distance of any combined and graphically complicated sign (red cross and red crescent together, or any other juxtaposed signs) is far from satisfactory. At a time when considerable efforts are being made to improve identification of the persons and

property protected by international humanitarian law, this argument must be taken into due account.

The ICRC would therefore like a calm and candid debate to be held on this subject and would be prepared to contribute to such a debate and to examine any proposal likely to lead to a solution. For its part, the ICRC has come to the conclusion that a third sign would offer considerable advantages and would be a solution worth examining in depth within the Movement. If the Movement were to agree that a new, third sign be made available to the States and National Societies wishing to have it, the disadvantages mentioned above with regard to the existing emblems could probably be avoided. This sign would have to meet the requirements of visibility, be free from any religious, political, cultural or other connotations and be chosen with the utmost care.

The emblems of the red cross and the red crescent certainly continue to enjoy great respect and to perform their function of protection in the large majority of cases. Moreover, the ICRC is fully aware of the fact that States alone are competent to change the existing situation with regard to emblems.

Nevertheless, the considerations set out above should encourage the Movement to re-examine these problems, and the study on the future of the Movement that has now been undertaken gives it an opportunity to do so. All proposals should be submitted to the Council of Delegates and then, of course, to the States party to the Geneva Conventions, if the proposal entails any amendment of these instruments.

Cornelio Sommaruga
President
International Committee of
the Red Cross

**REGULATIONS ON THE USE
OF THE EMBLEM OF THE RED CROSS
OR THE RED CRESCENT
BY THE NATIONAL SOCIETIES**

*adopted by the 20th International Conference
(Vienna, 1965)*

*and revised by the Council of Delegates
(Budapest, 1991)*

PREAMBLE

The Regulations on the Use of the Emblem of the Red Cross or the Red Crescent by the National Societies, adopted by the 20th International Conference in Vienna in 1965, were revised by the Council of Delegates in Budapest in November 1991. After the postponement of the 26th International Conference, the ICRC submitted the text of the present Regulations to all the States party to the Geneva Conventions, inviting them to inform it within a period of six months of any objections they might have. No amendments having been submitted, the Regulations therefore came into force at the end of that period.

The main rules governing the use of the emblem are contained in the Geneva Conventions and many countries have made them part of their national legislation, chiefly to be able to repress any misuse of the emblem. The Regulations specify the various conditions governing the use of the emblem by National Societies and their members in greater detail.

One of the purposes of revising the Regulations in 1991 was to enable the National Societies to diversify and expand their sources of income, without prejudice to the respect due to the emblem and the name of the red cross or red crescent.

The ICRC stressed that the Regulations were in accordance with the law. While it considers that the scope allowed by the revised version is as wide as it possibly can be within the framework of the Geneva Conventions, it nonetheless finds this broad interpretation of them acceptable. There is, however, nothing to prevent National Societies from setting narrower limits if they so wish.

Regulations on the use of the emblem of the Red Cross or the Red Crescent by the National Societies

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

- 1. Purpose of the Regulations**
- 2. Legal basis**
- 3. Field of application**
- 4. Contents of the Regulations**

CHAPTER I GENERAL RULES

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| Article 1 | Purposes of the emblem |
| Article 2 | Competence of the National Society |
| Article 3 | Prestige and respect of the emblem |
| Article 4 | Distinction between the two uses |
| Article 5 | Design of the emblem |
| Article 6 | Visibility of the emblem used as a protective device |
| Article 7 | Internal regulations of the National Society |

CHAPTER II PROTECTIVE USE OF THE EMBLEM

SECTION 1 GENERAL PRINCIPLE

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| Article 8 | Consent of the Authority and conditions governing the use
of the emblem |
|------------------|--|

SECTION 2 PERSONS

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| Article 9 | Medical personnel of the National Society |
|------------------|--|

SECTION 3 OBJECTS

- Article 10** Medical units and transports of the National Society
- Article 11** Specific rules for marking
- Article 12** Optional distinctive signals
- Article 13** Marking already in time of peace

SECTION 4 SPECIFIC RULES

- Article 14** Simultaneous use of the emblem as a protective and as an indicative device
- Article 15** National Society of a neutral or other State not party to the conflict

CHAPTER III INDICATIVE USE OF THE EMBLEM

SECTION 1 PERSONS

- Article 16** Members and employees of the National Society
- Article 17** Members of the Red Cross or Red Crescent Youth
- Article 18** Other persons authorized by the National Society to wear the emblem

SECTION 2 OBJECTS

- Article 19** Buildings and premises used by the National Society
- Article 20** Buildings and premises belonging to the National Society, not occupied by it
- Article 21** Hospitals, aid stations and means of transportation of the National Society
- Article 22** Aid stations and ambulances run or used by third parties

SECTION 3 DISSEMINATION AND FUND-RAISING

- Article 23** Campaigns and events organized by the National Society
- Article 24** Requests by third parties to use the emblem

SECTION 4 SPECIFIC RULES

- Article 25** Co-operation with other organizations
- Article 26** Medals and other tokens of acknowledgement
- Article 27** Relief consignments

INTRODUCTION

1. Purpose of the Regulations

These Regulations (hereinafter “the Regulations”) stipulate the various ways the emblem of the red cross or the red crescent on a white ground may be used by the National Societies, in keeping with the provisions of international humanitarian law and the Fundamental Principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement (hereinafter “the Movement”).

2. Legal basis

The Regulations are based on the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, mainly on the First Convention (Convention for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and sick in armed forces in the field) and, for certain provisions, on Protocol I of 8 June 1977 additional to the Geneva Conventions, relative to the protection of victims of international armed conflicts.

Article 44 of the First Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 makes the distinction between the protective use and the indicative use of the emblem and outlines the general rules governing the two uses.

Protocol I extends the protective use of the emblem by giving to the competent State authority (hereinafter “the Authority”) the possibility of granting such use to categories of persons and objects not covered by the 1949 Conventions. It further introduces the possibility of using distinctive visual, acoustic or electronic signals.

3. Field of application

The Regulations apply to all National Red Cross or Red Crescent Societies. They develop Article 44 of the First Convention which sets out the obligations of the National Societies with regard to the emblem. The limits they impose on the lawful use of the emblem must therefore be respected, but this does not prevent the National Societies from laying down stricter rules.

When Protocol I is applicable, certain provisions of the Regulations take on a broader meaning which concerns the National Society of the State in which Protocol I is in force; it does not concern the National Society of a State not party to Protocol I, except with the consent of the Authority.

4. Contents of the Regulations

The Regulations contain one chapter dealing with the protective use of the emblem and another on its indicative use. The two chapters are preceded by general rules which should provide guidelines for cases not specifically mentioned in either chapter.

The articles of the Regulations are usually accompanied by a commentary, in italics, which refers where necessary to the relevant articles of the Geneva Conventions and Protocol I.

CHAPTER I GENERAL RULES

Article 1

Purposes of the emblem

The protective use of the emblem is meant to mark medical and religious personnel and equipment which must be respected and protected in armed conflicts.

The indicative use of the emblem serves to show that persons or objects are linked to the Movement.

There is only one emblem, but it can be used for two different purposes: the first use of the emblem is as a visible sign of the protection conferred by international humanitarian law on certain persons and objects, in particular those belonging to or made available to the Army Medical Service and medical staff from National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and from civil defence organizations (Articles 38 and 44, First Convention; Article 8 [c] of Protocol I). The second use of the emblem indicates only that persons or objects displaying it are linked to the Movement.

Article 2

Competence of the National Society

The National Society may use the emblem as a protective device only with the consent of and in accordance with the conditions laid down by the Authority.

The National Society may make use of the emblem as an indicative device in peacetime and during armed conflicts within the limits stipulated in national legislation, the Regulations, and its statutes.

Re paragraph 1: Therefore, the National Society does not have the right to use the emblem as a protective device merely because it is the National Society. It is up to States to take the necessary steps to allow and to supervise the protective use of the emblem. In order to avoid the National Society being caught unprepared in the event of an armed conflict, the Authority should determine already in peacetime the National Society's role as auxiliary to the Army Medical Service and its right to use the emblem for its medical personnel and equipment.

Article 3

Prestige and respect of the emblem

The National Society may use the emblem only for activities consistent with the principles set out by International Conferences of the Red Cross and Red Crescent. It shall ensure at all time that nothing shall tarnish its prestige or reduce the respect due to the emblem.

The principles mentioned, the Fundamental Principles in particular, are those which give to the Movement its aims and are the basis of its specific action: voluntary assistance to those who suffer, to the direct and indirect victims of conflicts and of natural and social disasters. The raison d'être of the Red Cross/Red Crescent is set out in the Preamble to the Movement's Statutes.

National Societies shall refrain from displaying the emblem when carrying out activities which have only a tenuous connection with their essential mission.

Article 4

Distinction between the two uses

Any confusion between the protective use and the indicative use of the emblem must be avoided. In armed conflicts, the National Society which

continues its peacetime activities shall take all the necessary measures to ensure that the emblem used indicatively, displayed on persons or objects, is seen only as marking their connection with the National Society and not as conferring the right to protection under international humanitarian law. In particular, the emblem shall be relatively small and shall not be placed on armlets or roofs. The National Society shall endeavour to follow the latter rule in peacetime so as to avoid from the very beginning of a conflict any confusion with the emblem used as a protective device.

It is not so much the design of the emblem that can lead to confusion as the circumstances in which it is displayed. Hence, it is particularly in situations in which the emblem may also be used as a protective device, i.e. in armed conflicts, that it is necessary to avoid any confusion. In order to obviate this risk, it is recommended that the National Societies use as an indicative device, already in peacetime, an emblem of relatively small dimensions. For the same reason, it is further recommended that, also in peacetime, they refrain from placing the emblem on armlets, roofs or even flags. However, the use of a large-size emblem is not excluded in certain cases, such as events where it is important for first-aid workers to be easily identifiable.

Article 5

Design of the emblem

The emblem used as a protective device shall always retain its original form, i.e. nothing shall be added either to the cross, the crescent or the white ground. A cross formed with two cross-pieces, one vertical and the other horizontal crossing in the middle, shall be used. The shape and direction of the crescent are not regulated. Neither the cross nor the crescent shall touch the edges of the flag or the shield. The shade of the red is not specified. The ground shall always be white.

The emblem used indicatively shall be accompanied by the name or initials of the National Society. There shall be no drawing or writing on the cross or the crescent which shall always be the dominant element of the emblem. The ground shall always be white.

Use of the emblem for decorative purposes is permitted, within the limits of Article 3, on the occasion of public events or on material intended to promote the National Society and the Movement, such as films, publications, medals or other tokens of acknowledgement. For such use a freer design is permitted, provided that national legislation does not prohibit it. Moreover, the emblem used as an indicative device should as far as possible be displayed together with the decorative design.

Re paragraph 1: The design of the emblem must be clear so that persons and objects with the right to use it can be easily identified and thus effectively protected. Protection, however, does not depend on the emblem: a protected person not marked or badly marked obviously does not lose his right to protection because of this.

Re paragraphs 2 and 3: A distinction must be made between the indicative use showing that a person or an object is linked to the Society, in which case strict design is essential, and indicative use for the purpose of promoting the National Society and the Movement, in which case a freer design is permitted if it is not prejudicial to the prestige of the emblem. With regard to the latter case, it is up to the National Society to decide, depending on the national legislation and the national context, whether it is possible or advisable to authorize such use. The freer design may consist, for example, of a red cross set with gold, a crescent with graded shades of red, a cross cut out, or an emblem with a motif. The Society shall not display such a design on the buildings it uses or on its letterhead, as these are typical cases of indicative use.

Article 6

Visibility of the emblem used as a protective device

The emblem used as a protective device must be identifiable from as far away as possible. It shall be as large as necessary under the circumstances. At night or when visibility is reduced, it may be lighted or illuminated. It shall as far as possible be made of materials rendering it recognizable by technical means of detection and displayed on flags or flat surfaces visible from as many directions as possible, including from the air.

Article 7

Internal regulations of the National Society

The National Society shall lay down the conditions governing the use of the emblem in regulations or internal directives.

The regulations or directives may consist, for example, of:

A. Concerning the protective use of the emblem:

— *the reference to the national legislation on the subject and to the Regulations;*

- *the indication of the competent authorities who can authorize the use of the emblem;*
- *the list of steps to be taken at the beginning of a conflict to avoid any confusion with the indicative use of the emblem;*
- *the conditions governing the use of the emblem for persons and objects of the National Society.*

B. Concerning the indicative use of the emblem:

- *the reference to the national legislation on the subject and to the Regulations;*
- *the conditions governing the use of the emblem by members of the National Society and by members of the Red Cross or Red Crescent Youth;*
- *the mention of other persons not members of the National Society but trained by it and authorized to wear the emblem;*
- *the list of aid stations and ambulances run by third parties authorized to use the emblem;*
- *the dimensions and proportions of the emblem;*
- *details concerning the use of the emblem for fund-raising and dissemination purposes and on medals or other tokens of acknowledgement;*
- *the rules governing the documents carried by persons to justify their use of the emblem, or persons in charge of objects marked with the emblem.*

CHAPTER II

PROTECTIVE USE OF THE EMBLEM

SECTION 1

GENERAL PRINCIPLE

Article 8

Consent of the Authority and conditions governing the use of the emblem

Before using the emblem as a protective device the National Society must receive permission from the Authority and with it lay down the rules governing its use. The National Society shall take the necessary measures to see that its members respect those rules and to avoid any confusion with the indicative use of the emblem.

The National Society shall endeavour already in peacetime to lay down with the Authority rules governing the protective use of the emblem, in the event of armed conflict, by its medical personnel and on its medical equipment. Regarding the risk of confusion, see Article 4 above.

In cases where it is not practically possible for the Authority to give its permission (for example, in the event of serious disturbances), and where there is an obvious and urgent need for humanitarian measures, the National Society may act on the assumption that such permission has been granted. This is because the principle of humanity requires action to be taken. Furthermore, the National Society need fear no penalty under international law as the essential purpose of international law is to serve mankind; faced with a glaring need for humanitarian action, a formal obstacle such as that mentioned above must not be allowed to block an initiative that so clearly corresponds to the spirit of the law. These points apply to Articles 8 to 10 of the present Regulations.

SECTION 2 PERSONS

Article 9

Medical personnel of the National Society

The medical personnel of the National Society authorized to wear the emblem as a protective device shall display it during the discharge of their duties in a manner ensuring optimum visibility.

In evidence of their status, such personnel shall carry identity cards issued by the Authority.

Re paragraph 1: *Medical personnel status is granted to the National Society personnel when it is placed at the disposal of the Army Medical Service (Article 26, First Convention) and when, in the discharge of its tasks, it is "regularly and solely engaged in the operation and administration of civilian hospitals" (Article 20, Fourth Convention).*

Protocol I gives the Authority the possibility of granting the right to use the emblem as a protective device to all civil medical personnel, which can thus include National Society medical personnel not covered by the 1949 Conventions. A definition of medical personnel is set out in Article 8, subparagraph (c) of Protocol I.

Special emphasis must be put on the visibility of the emblem, particularly when the emblem is worn in occupied territories and areas where fighting has broken out or seems about to break out. See also Article 6 above.

Re paragraph 2: *See Articles 40 and 41 and Annex II, First Convention, and Article 18, paragraph 3, Protocol I and Articles 1 and 2 of Annex I to Protocol I. The National Society shall, if necessary, remind the Authority of its duty to issue such identity cards to the Society's medical personnel.*

SECTION 3

OBJECTS

Article 10

Medical units and transports of the National Society

The medical units and transports of the National Society authorized by the Authority to display the emblem as a protective device shall do so in a manner ensuring optimum visibility.

In the Conventions, the medical units and transports include medical units and establishments, medical buildings, medical equipment and transports (see Chapters III, V and VI of the First Convention). With regard to the National Society, these include hospitals, ambulances, hospital ships, aircraft and stores of medical material when placed at the disposal of the Army Medical Service, as well as civilian hospitals belonging to it, when these have been recognized as such and authorized by the Authority to display the emblem (see Article 18 of the Fourth Convention).

Protocol I gives the Authority the possibility of granting the right to use the emblem as a protective device to all civilian medical units and means of medical transport, which can therefore include National Society medical units and means of medical transport not covered by the 1949 Geneva Conventions. A definition of medical units, medical transport and means of medical transport is set out in Article 8, subparagraphs (e), (f) and (g) of Protocol I.

Detailed comments on the visibility of the emblem are contained in Article 42 of the First Convention and Chapter II of Annex I to Protocol I. See also Article 6 above.

Article 11

Specific rules for marking

Hospital ships and coastal rescue craft of the National Society shall be marked with the emblem as provided for in Article 43 of the Second Geneva Convention of 1949.

Medical aircraft of the National Society shall be marked in conformity with Article 36 of the First Convention.

Re paragraph 1: Hospital ships and coastal rescue craft (or rescue craft, as they are referred to nowadays since, being often of large tonnage and long range, they may operate far from the coast) must carry a document from the Authority declaring that they were under its control when they were being fitted out or when they set sail. Their names and characteristics must be communicated to all the parties to the conflict. These hospital ships and rescue craft are exempt from capture. More detailed rules for marking are set out in Article 43 of the Second Convention. See also Articles 22 to 35 of the Second Convention and Articles 3 to 11 of Annex I to Protocol I.

Moreover, in accordance with Article 23 of Protocol I, other ships and craft of the National Society used temporarily or permanently for medical purposes shall be marked in conformity with the provisions of Article 43, paragraph 2, of the Second Convention. These ships and craft are not exempt from capture.

Re paragraph 2: The relevant provisions are Articles 36 of the First Convention, 39 of the Second Convention, 22 of the Fourth Convention, Articles 24 to 31 of Protocol I, and 5 to 13 of Annex I to Protocol I.

Article 12

Optional distinctive signals

With the consent of the Authority, in addition to the emblem, the National Society may make its medical units and transports identifiable by the recognized optional distinctive signals, namely, the blue light signal, the radio signal and electronic means of identification.

The regulations on distinctive signals can be found in:

- *Annex I of Protocol I, Articles 5 to 8;*
- *Document 9051 (blue lights) of the Airworthiness Technical Manual issued by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO);*
- *Section II of Article 40 and Section III of Article N 40 (medical transport) of the Radio Regulations issued by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU);*
- *Chapter XIV of the International Code of Signals issued by the International Maritime Organization (IMO).*

Article 13

Marking already in time of peace

With the consent of the Authority, the National Society may, already in time of peace, use the emblem and optional distinctive signals to identify units and transports whose assignment to medical purposes in the event of an armed conflict is definitively decided.

SECTION 4

SPECIFIC RULES

Article 14

Simultaneous use of the emblem as a protective and as an indicative device

Unless otherwise directed by the Authority, the National Society may authorize its members to display the emblem as an indicative device, together with its name, simultaneously with the emblem used as a protective device.

Under the same conditions, the objects placed at the disposal of the Authority may also bear the emblem with the name of the Society.

In such cases, the emblem used as an indicative device and the name of the National Society must be of small dimensions.

Article 15

National Society of a neutral or other State not Party to the conflict

The National Society of a neutral or other State not Party to the conflict that intends to provide medical personnel or objects to any Party to an armed conflict must obtain prior consent from the said Party and from its own State authorities. The rules governing the protective use of the emblem must be established by the said Party to the conflict. The said persons and objects may display the emblem from the moment of their departure on mission.

See on this point Article 27, First Convention.

CHAPTER III

INDICATIVE USE OF THE EMBLEM

SECTION 1

PERSONS

Article 16

Members and employees of the National Society

The members and the employees of the National Society may wear the emblem, usually of small dimensions, when on duty.

When not on duty, members may only wear an emblem of very small dimensions, for example, in the form of a brooch or a badge.

Save in exceptional circumstances, the emblem shall be accompanied by the name or initials of the National Society.

***Re paragraph 1:** Although in its indicative use the emblem is usually of small dimensions, it may at times be of large dimensions, especially when meant to allow easy identification of first-aid workers (see Article 4 above and its commentary).*

***Re paragraph 2:** In this case the emblem must be of very small dimensions because its use is not related to any specific activity carried out on behalf of the Society.*

***Re paragraph 3:** As a general rule volunteers should be identifiable as members of the National Society. However, in some cases they should be allowed to forego use of the name or initials of the Society alongside the emblem, for example during internal disturbances when such markings may hinder their work.*

Article 17

Members of the Red Cross or Red Crescent Youth

Article 16 above is applicable. The emblem shall be accompanied by the words “Red Cross Youth” or “Red Crescent Youth” or the initials “RCY”.

Article 18

Other persons authorized by the National Society to wear the emblem

The National Society may authorize, under the conditions laid down in its own internal regulations, persons who are not members of the National

Society but have taken its courses or passed its exams to wear an emblem of very small dimensions and accompanied by the name or the initials of the National Society, for example, in the form of a brooch or a badge.

These persons are usually first-aid workers or nurses thus brought to the attention of the public.

SECTION 2

OBJECTS

Article 19

Buildings and premises used by the National Society

The emblem, accompanied by the name of the National Society, may be displayed on the buildings and premises used by the Society, whether or not they belong to it.

When only part of the buildings is used by the National Society, the emblem may be displayed only on the part which it occupies.

The emblem shall be of relatively small dimensions and shall not be displayed on the roof, in order to avoid, in the event of armed conflict, any confusion with the emblem used as a protective device.

Re paragraph 2: When the National Society shares a building with other persons or societies, it shall ensure that the activities of its neighbours are not indirectly detrimental to the prestige of the emblem.

Re paragraph 3: Regarding the risk of confusion, see Article 4 above.

Article 20

Buildings and premises belonging to the National Society, not occupied by it

The National Society shall not mark with the emblem buildings or premises belonging to it, not occupied by it but which it rents or lends to third parties.

Article 21

Hospitals, aid stations¹ and means of transportation of the National Society

The emblem, accompanied by the name of the National Society, may figure on hospitals and aid stations run by the Society and on the means of transportation, especially ambulances, used by its members and employees. Subject to Article 13, the emblem so used shall be of relatively small dimensions in order to avoid, in the event of armed conflict, confusion with the emblem used as a protective device.

With regard to hospitals, it should be noted that the indicative use of the emblem is reserved exclusively for hospitals of the National Society, not forgetting, however, that those hospitals which the Authority intends to authorize to display the emblem as a protective device in time of armed conflict may—with the consent of the Authority—be marked accordingly already in peacetime (see Articles 10 and 13 above).

In order to prevent any misuse, the National Society shall remove or cover the emblem and its name if it lends a means of transportation to other organizations.

Regarding the risk of confusion, see Article 4 above.

Article 22

Aid stations² and ambulances run or used by third parties

The National Society may permit third parties to use the emblem, in peacetime and in conformity with national legislation, to mark aid stations used exclusively to give free treatment and ambulances.

¹ The United Nations Convention on road signs and signals adopted in Vienna on 8 November 1968, and the European agreement supplementing it, adopted in Geneva on 1 May 1971, include two road signs displaying the emblem:

- (a) the sign “First-aid stations” (F, 1a), made up of the red cross or red crescent on a white ground, the whole framed by blue. As this is an indicative use of the emblem, the National Society shall request the authorities to use this sign to mark only aid stations run or authorized by it;
- (b) the “hospital” sign (E, 12b), made up of a red cross or red crescent on a blue ground with a white bed. Since this is a misuse of the emblem, the National Society shall request the authorities to use the other “hospital” sign (E, 12a) only. This sign is also provided for in these agreements and is made up of the letter H in white on a blue ground.

² See (1) Article 21.

The National Society shall only give this permission in exchange for the right regularly to control the use of the emblem. It shall reserve the right to withdraw this authorization at all times and with immediate effect.

Article 44, paragraph 4 of the First Convention allows the marking, besides ambulances, of aid stations “exclusively assigned for the purpose of giving free treatment”. Experience has shown that this rule of free treatment is often interpreted with a degree of flexibility. This practice is acceptable, and in conformity with the spirit of the Convention, only in so far as treatment is in no case conditional on payment of a fee and the idea of voluntary service linked to the Movement is upheld.

SECTION 3 DISSEMINATION AND FUND-RAISING

Article 23 **Campaigns and events organized by** **the National Society**

The National Society may use the emblem to support the campaigns and events it organizes to make its activities known, to disseminate knowledge of international humanitarian law and of the Movement’s Fundamental Principles, or to raise funds, within the limits of Articles 2 to 5 of the Regulations.

When displayed on printed matter, objects or other advertising material of such campaigns, the emblem shall be accompanied, as far as practically possible, by the name of the Society or a text or publicity drawing. The objects shall in no way suggest the protection of international humanitarian law or membership of the Movement, nor give rise to misuse at some later date. The object shall be of reduced dimensions or else made of rapidly perishable material.

A National Society which co-operates with a commercial company or other organization in order to raise funds or further its dissemination activities may display the company’s trademark, logo or name on articles used by the Society, on its advertising material or items which it sells, provided that the following conditions are met:

- (a) no confusion must be created in the mind of the public between the company’s activities or the quality of its products and the emblem or the National Society itself;
- (b) the National Society must retain control over the entire campaign, in particular the choice of articles on which the company’s trademark, logo or name is displayed and the siting, form and size of such markings;

- (c) the campaign must be linked to one particular activity and, as a general rule, be limited in time and geographical area;
- (d) the company concerned must in no way be engaged in activities running counter to the Movement's objectives and Principles or which might be regarded by the public as controversial;
- (e) the National Society must reserve the right to cancel its contract with the company concerned at any time and to do so at very short notice, should the company's activities undermine the respect for or the prestige of the emblem;
- (f) the material or financial advantage which the National Society gains from the campaign must be substantial without, however, jeopardizing the Society's independence;
- (g) the contract between the National Society and its partner must be in writing;
- (h) the contract must be approved by the National Society's central leadership.

The National Society may authorize commercial companies or other organizations to mention in their advertising material that they have made a donation to or otherwise contributed to the National Society's work. Such mention may also be authorized on products for sale the proceeds from which are to be donated in full or in part to the National Society. Such authorization shall, however, be subject to strict compliance with the conditions set out in the previous paragraph, subparagraphs (a), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h). During a promotional campaign, the National Society shall reserve the right to inspect the company's accounts pertaining to that campaign. Moreover, the National Society shall carefully monitor the manner in which the assistance is described in the advertising material or on the products mentioned above. The same applies to any photographs or other visual material used within the context of the campaign. It shall not authorize the display of its emblem on items for sale and may authorize its display on advertising material only with the utmost restraint and on condition that the emblem be of small dimensions and accompanied by a clear explanation of the assistance received by the Society. The National Society shall ensure that the conditions governing the use of the emblem are an essential part of its contract with the company and that deliberate violation of those conditions entitles the Society to terminate the contract with immediate effect, without being liable for any compensation.

Re paragraph 1: *The reference to Article 3 above leads to the conclusion that the name and emblem may be used for fund-raising purposes to sell an object or give a momentary service, but not, for instance, to sell a lasting or*

a long-term service, especially if the service has no connection with the Movement's traditional activities or competes with other similar services provided on a commercial basis. The aim is to prevent sales of objects or services of the National Society and the events it organizes from becoming more representative of its work than its humanitarian and social activities.

Re paragraph 2: *Such advertising material, distributed or sold to the public, can consist of printed matter and objects of all kinds: leaflets, publications, posters, philatelic souvenirs, films, pencils, etc. With regard to clothing, flags or banners — given the risk of confusion which such objects could create, in the event of armed conflict, with the emblem used as a protective device — it is essential to ensure that the emblem is accompanied by the name of the National Society, or a text or a publicity drawing.*

Re paragraph 3: *The general provisions set out in the first two paragraphs obviously apply to the specific situations described in paragraph 3. Use of the red cross or red crescent emblem or name by "individuals, societies, firms or companies either public or private" is prohibited by international humanitarian law (First Geneva Convention, Article 53). It is nevertheless acceptable for a National Society to mention that it has received certain assistance from a commercial company or other organization. Insisting that the donors of such assistance remain anonymous could mean that the National Society would lose major sources of funds or other benefits. It is nevertheless important that the National Society closely monitor the manner in which the assistance is publicized so as to avoid any abuse or risk of confusion in the mind of the public. The conditions set out in paragraph 3 provide precise guidelines in that respect.*

Subparagraphs (a) and (b)

It is necessary first and foremost to avoid any confusion in the mind of the public between commercial companies and the emblem or the National Society itself. Thus, when a National Society announces that it is receiving support from a commercial company in a given campaign (for example in producing printed matter or other items), the Society must ensure that the role played by the company is expressly defined and that the emblem can in no way be interpreted as guaranteeing product quality. It must also ensure that the company's trademark, logo or name remains in reasonable proportions compared with the rest of the display.

Subparagraph (c)

The National Society may not involve a commercial company in its activities as a whole but only in specific programmes. The duration of its association with the company must be determined in advance and should not exceed

three years. Moreover, it must be limited to the country's territory unless there is an agreement with the National Society (or Societies) of any other State on whose territory the campaign would also be held.

Subparagraph (d)

Some companies are engaged in activities which are themselves directly contrary to the Movement's objectives (for example the manufacture or sale of arms, tobacco, alcohol or products clearly seen as being harmful to the environment). The linking of the names or logos of such companies with those of a National Society must therefore be avoided.

Subparagraph (e)

Association with a commercial company whose activity is not contrary to the Movement's objectives could prove embarrassing for reasons not known to the National Society when it enters into the agreement (serious pollution by the company concerned, for example). It is therefore essential that the National Society be able to end its association with the company very rapidly.

Subparagraph (f)

Sponsorship is an important serious matter, which should be envisaged only when major contracts are involved and when substantial advantages will be gained by the National Society concerned. However, the Society must ensure that the advantages gained do not make it dependent on the company concerned. Financial gain, for example, should not exceed a certain percentage of the Society's total resources (20% maximum).

Subparagraph (g)

It is also essential that all terms and conditions of the agreement between the National Society and the contracting company or organization be the subject of a written contract.

Subparagraph (h)

Before an agreement is reached between the National Society and the contracting company or organization it must be discussed by the body normally responsible for making decisions pertaining to the National Society's administration.

Re paragraph 4: *To avoid the loss of major sources of funds, the National Society may authorize a commercial company or other organization that has contributed to its work to mention this assistance in its advertising material or on products for sale the proceeds from which are to be donated in full or in part to the National Society. However, as this entails a considerable*

risk of abuse, the conditions set out in paragraph 3, subparagraphs (a), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h) must be strictly observed.

Moreover, the National Society must ensure that such mention remain discreet and not give rise to confusion. The emblem may be reproduced in the companies' advertising material. It is though prohibited to display the emblem on products or items for sale, since they are often designed to last and the National Society has no control over their use.

Wherever such reproduction in advertising material is authorized, the emblem must be of small dimensions and should be accompanied by an explanation enabling the public to clearly understand the relationship between the National Society and the contracting company or organization.

Furthermore, the National Society shall reserve the right to inspect the company's accounts pertaining to the activities connected with the promotional campaign. The Society may exercise this right itself or through a specialized institution, for example an auditing firm.

Finally, in addition to the right of cancellation stipulated in Article 23, paragraph 3, subparagraph (e), the National Society shall reserve the right to terminate the contract with immediate effect, without being liable for any compensation, should the conditions governing the use of the emblem be deliberately violated by the contracting company or organization.

Article 24

Requests by third parties to use the emblem

With the exception of the cases mentioned in Articles 18, 22 and 23 above, and those provided for in the present Article with a view to promoting the activities of the Society and the Movement, the National Society may not authorize any third parties to use the emblem.

The National Society can accede to a request for the emblem to be put on objects to be sold on the market if such objects represent persons or objects which may display the emblem in reality in accordance with the Geneva Conventions, as a protective or indicative device, and if the emblem is not placed alongside the trademark of the company in question. The authorization shall be limited to a specific time or number of objects. It may be subject to payment but its main aim shall remain dissemination of international humanitarian law or of the activities of the National Society and the Movement.

The National Society may authorize use of the emblem by institutions whose purpose is not commercial but solely to make known or to promote the activities of the Society and of the Movement.

The National Society shall require that third parties provide all facilities necessary to exercise control on the use of the emblem at any time, with the possibility of withdrawing its authorization with immediate effect.

***Re paragraph 1:** It is therefore clear that, except in the above-mentioned cases, the National Society may not authorize third parties to use the emblem. Such use calls for very strict control on the part of the National Society and must therefore remain an exception.*

***Re paragraph 2:** These can be, for instance, miniature military ambulances, or figurines representing members of the Army Medical Service or of the National Society. The authorization will be valid only in the country of the National Society giving it, except where there is an agreement with the National Society(ies) of one or several other countries. Moreover, the National Society will have to take care that by granting such authorization it does not favour one company to the detriment of another. Even where permission to use the emblem is not granted in return for a financial contribution, the rules laid down in Article 23 concerning respect for the emblem apply to the cases provided for in the present Article. Likewise, companies wishing to use the emblem, even for purposes other than financial gain, must ask the National Society for permission and the general conditions set out in Article 23 must be met.*

***Re paragraph 3:** The National Society may grant the authorization to institutions such as associations or foundations whose purpose is to promote the activities of the Society and of the Movement but which — for reasons of opportuneness or some legal reason (for example, fiscal) — are legal entities independent of the National Society. It should be noted that these institutions are entitled to the emblem only in so far as it is used to make known or promote the activities of the Society and of the Movement, and not by their members as such. It is therefore important that the use of the emblem be strictly controlled by the National Society (see paragraph 4 above).*

SECTION 4 SPECIFIC RULES

Article 25 Co-operation with other organizations

In addition to the cases mentioned in Articles 23 and 24, the National Society may in exceptional circumstances use the emblem jointly with that of another humanitarian organization, in the event of a specific undertaking and

provided that such use is discreet and does not give rise to confusion in the public mind between the National Society and the other organization.

In principle, the National Society must not use its emblem jointly with that of other organizations. It must endeavour to find a way of avoiding such a procedure and should have recourse to joint use only in exceptional circumstances, in connection with humanitarian activities or dissemination campaigns (for example, in a joint publication). In such cases, only indicative use may be made of the emblem.

Article 26

Medals and other tokens of acknowledgement

The emblem may figure on medals and other tokens of acknowledgement given by the National Society, on condition that it is shown together with its name and, if possible, a few words describing the purpose of the medal or defining the services rendered. Its design may be decorative, in accordance with the conditions set out in Article 5, paragraph 3 above.

Article 27

Relief consignments

The National Society may use the emblem, accompanied by its name or its initials, to mark relief consignments sent by rail, road, sea or air and intended for victims of armed conflicts or natural disasters. The National Society shall take the measures necessary to prevent any misuse.

It is important to note that this right applies only to relief consignments themselves, to allow identification of their origin, and not to the means of transport used.

Humanitarian assistance

“Humanitarian ambition” *

by Frédéric Maurice†

A few hours before leaving for Sarajevo last May, Frédéric Maurice let us have the final pages of an article for the Review. He wanted to mull over his text and polish it, but fate decided otherwise, since he lost his life in tragic circumstances on 19 May 1992, on the outskirts of Sarajevo.

As a tribute to our late friend, we are publishing the text as it stands, an off-the-cuff personal reflection on the present-day problems of humanitarian assistance.

Our feelings in doing so are all the stronger in that the article is a good reflection of Frédéric’s personality, intelligence, generosity and personal commitment, and of his gift of analysis served by an incisive style with a slight bite to it.

Nor is that all: the article well reflects the state of mind of the ICRC’s delegate “operators” (a word he was fond of) who, not content with showing steadfast commitment to the humanitarian cause and to the duties inherent in their mission, strive to draw from their field experience arguments to combat the deviation of humanitarian assistance and constantly improve aid to victims. For the truth is that, even if it is sometimes checked by misgivings, “humanitarian ambition” feeds above all on hope.

Frédéric Maurice gave considerable thought to his work. Looking beyond the problems of humanitarian assistance and the case for and against the “right to intervene”, he is inviting us to reflect on a new philosophy of humanitarianism.

The Review

* Title by the editor

A "right to intervene" has been proposed.¹ Is it a public relations exercise aimed at Western consumers? A fresh slant on humanitarian action? At the very least, its proponents and the ideas they put forward have the merit of having induced a host of people to think about international solidarity.

As early as 1988 the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) expressed reservations about a draft resolution on humanitarian assistance, submitted to it by Dr. Bernard Kouchner, the then French Secretary of State for Humanitarian Action. In essence, the ICRC feared that the highly ambitious wording might revive old resentments in many States all the more sensitive about their prerogatives because they were destabilized by conflict or affected by population displacements or famine.

The lesson of four years' experience of arduous negotiations during the latest revision of international humanitarian law (IHL) from 1974-1977 was that no serious regulatory headway could be expected in the present circumstances. In particular, the development of rules defining the conditions governing the right of civilian populations to assistance in times of armed conflict and the procedure to be followed had proved extremely laborious and it seemed hard to go beyond the compromises already reached. There was a very real risk that resubmitting the same issues to States in a different forum might result in a setback, a regression in law which would inevitably mar the recent and still fragile progress made in the Protocols additional to the Geneva Conventions.

Yet beyond the technical proposals concerning the right to assistance, the draft resolution stemmed from a pronounced desire to renew the spirit, inspiration and implementation of humanitarian action; in short, to rethink the entire approach. The sole purpose of the media campaign that revolved around the concept of the "right of intervention" was to show that humanitarianism had yet to be invented, that a new generation of field workers had been born, that a modern body of law was taking shape and that United Nations General Assembly Resolutions 43/131 and 45/100 marked the first innovative steps towards it.²

¹ See the articles published in the *Review* on humanitarian assistance and on the question of the "*droit d'ingérence humanitaire*" and the right to assistance, *IRRC*, No. 288, July-August 1992, pp. 225-274.

² Humanitarian assistance to victims of natural disasters and similar emergency situations, Resolutions 43/131 of 8 December 1990 and 45/100 of 14 December 1990.

As these ideas were being developed, the ICRC — admittedly less in the limelight — was taking on unprecedented commitments in the field (a fourfold increase between 1987 and 1991) with the political, diplomatic and financial backing of a growing number of States in north and south alike. In France itself, official spokesmen reflecting the position of certain non-governmental organizations leapt to the defence of the achievements of IHL and of the humanitarian strategies which express them.

Humanitarian ambition

The initial discussion centred on the definition of humanitarian action as such. It is probably essential that revulsion for massacres and the ravages of utter deprivation should motivate individual humanitarian commitment, yet humanitarian action in time of war remains a thankless task, one which is congenitally incomplete and always humiliating to those who undertake it. The famine in Biafra, the killing fields of Cambodia and the destitution of the peoples of Tigray all exemplify the permanent failure which haunts those who try to humanize war and attenuate its effects. Developing a humanitarian methodology and project is difficult because of the closeness, within a narrow space, of overweening ambition, crushing historical and individual experience, and political constraints which lie outside the sphere of influence of humanitarian endeavour. The possibility of action over a longer period hinges on a proper management of these dialectics. Mysticism, paranoia and the temptation to assume power have always been the aberrations and canker of humanitarianism.

The Red Cross has opted once and for all to try to help and protect the victims of conflict, and no more than that. It deliberately leaves to others the task of building the “world government” and “everlasting peace”. Yet though prosaic and circumscribed, that ambition is nonetheless immense; deadlines are always urgent and the rules of the game severe. Judge for yourself:

1. The real danger in the post-Cold War era lies in the proliferation of internal conflicts which kill hundreds of thousands of civilians, displace millions of others, cause unimaginable infrastructural and environmental damage and shatter the frames of political, cultural and economic reference and systems of recourse. No continent is now safe from these new-style disasters: they can knock on any door and there is nothing exotic about them. Their victims are simply added to all those of last year’s barely extinguished and in reality still smouldering

conflicts, in the Americas, the Middle East, Afghanistan, the Indian subcontinent and South-East Asia.

The euphoria surrounding the fall of the Berlin wall is far behind us. Whole areas of the world are now prey to bloodshed and devastation on a scale hitherto unseen since the World Wars. Humanitarian romanticism seems quite derisory in the face of such a tide of suffering. Plausible action to tackle and heal this suffering everywhere will call for collective decisions and the carefully concerted mobilization of the means, techniques and resources of all the agencies concerned.

2. The need to "federate" efforts and projects and to institute authorized and recognized quality controls over the services provided is dictated not only by the volume of requirements but also by political parameters and the structure of the looming conflicts. The world is experiencing its third complete organizational upheaval this century. First, the principles upheld by Woodrow Wilson after the First World War did not preserve peace but they outlawed war so effectively as to hamper the development of humanitarian law. Humanitarian workers were thus very poorly equipped to protect civilians, who meanwhile had become the main victims of the wars in Abyssinia and Spain, of the Sino-Japanese war and, of course, of the Second World War.

The ideological divide during the Cold War that followed the Second World War subsequently barred the way to humanitarian action in many theatres of conflict, thus confounding repeated efforts to put the law into practical effect.

While it is hard to discern the exact contours of the era now beginning, we at least know that the international order will have many centres of power, be marked by economic gulfs and intolerable disparities in levels of development between north and south, and wracked by nationalist fevers, ethnic strife and cultural and religious antagonism.

It will be no easy matter adapting humanitarian strategy to fit these new facts: maintaining strict independence from the competing centres of power now emerging, safeguarding the acceptability and legitimacy of international aid in the face of hard-line ideologies and upholding the interests of those in need of assistance, firmly establishing and developing relations of mutual trust with a multitude of factions in vast areas of conflict, and surviving the dangerous shoals and quicksands of war. Individualism and resounding media statements will count for little in this undertaking. All that will count will be real courage, determination and the professionalism required to intervene in

theatres of operation which, as in Somalia and Liberia, are fading from the spheres of interest and solidarity of our world.

3. At the same time, humanitarian endeavour is gaining in legitimacy; the principle that States must answer for the oppression and massacres of which they are guilty, and the notion that the victims of internal strife must receive the same treatment as those of international wars, are thus gaining ground and are accepted in law. The imperatives of humanitarianism are impressing themselves on present-day political culture both as universal values and as the basis for binding collective responsibility and interest. Massacres, famine, war crimes and environmental disasters now explicitly entail collective responsibility at both the political and the humanitarian levels.

Legal expression of these developments is nothing new. As early as 1876 during the Herzegovina uprising, Gustave Moynier, the then President of the ICRC, asserted that the Geneva Convention was applicable in cases of civil war; the Convention was likened to "a kind of humanitarian profession of faith, a moral code which cannot be compulsory in certain cases and optional in others".³ And six years later the obligations of States were specified in the following terms: "Even if States are confronted with rebels, barbarians or perjurers, their duty is to treat them as humanely as would the most irreproachable observers of the Convention".⁴

Then again, under Article 1 of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 States gave their pledge not only to respect but also to ensure respect for humanitarian law in all circumstances. In January 1985, the ICRC launched its "Appeal for a Humanitarian Mobilization", pointing out in particular that "any government which, while not itself involved in a conflict, is in a position to exert a deterrent influence on a government violating the laws of war, but refrains from doing so, shares the responsibility for the breaches committed".⁵ It is worth noting that, in spite of the Appeal's innovative nature, the publicity given to it and the reactions from all sides, none of the 160 States approached questioned the principle of co-responsibility.

³ Gustave Moynier, *Study on the Geneva Convention*, 1876, quoted by Pierre Boissier, *History of the International Committee of the Red Cross*. Vol. I, *From Solferino to Tsushima*, Henry Dunant Institute and International Committee of the Red Cross, Geneva, 1985, p. 300.

⁴ Gustave Moynier, *The Red Cross: its Past and its Future*, 1882, quoted by Boissier, *ibid.* p. 300.

⁵ "ICRC Appeal for a Humanitarian Mobilization", in *IRRC*, No. 244, January-February 1985, pp. 30-34, *ad* 33."

Such legal developments — and naturally the operational practice which gives them tangible expression — were therefore favourable, having been prepared and advocated for many years, practically since the creation of the Red Cross and throughout the successive codifications of the Geneva Conventions. The field of human rights has developed in much the same way, and the idea that States guilty of massive human rights violations are answerable to the international community is now firmly established.

The same cannot be said of the issue of peaceful or military intervention by third States, nor more generally of the means and decision-making mechanisms available to them for imposing observance of the law. Let us purposely leave open the question of the legitimacy of “intervention on humanitarian grounds”, for it is a legal and political issue beyond the competence of a private humanitarian operator. Moreover, we all know its limits and pitfalls: subjection of humanitarian action to the vagaries of the law of the strongest, questioning of the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the unpredictable nature and inequality of treatment from one conflict to another, rejection by the States of the south and political exploitation of the whole gamut of humanitarian feeling.

In short, both the Holy Alliance and the Brezhnev doctrine amounted to a series of interventional rights asserted by the strongest, not that that rules out the idea that Tanzania’s intervention in Uganda and Viet Nam’s in Cambodia were to some extent justifiable by the martyrdom suffered by those two countries. However, whatever the intention behind them, those interventions were political acts, armed interventions which led to military occupation in the technical sense of the term.

One of the chief problems for humanitarian agencies will therefore be to preserve the clear distinction between the political responsibilities incumbent on States under IHL or human rights law, and those which come under the heading of neutral and impartial humanitarian action carried out by independent bodies in accordance with the principles laid down in the Geneva Conventions and recalled by the International Court of Justice in its ruling on the Case of Military and Paramilitary Activities In and Against Nicaragua. Recent initiatives taken in the field by the upholders of the right to intervene are undermining the credibility of operators present and active in many theatres. The official line, which fluctuates between an advocacy of intervention and an endorsement of the primacy of state sovereignty affirmed in Resolution 43/131, clearly expresses the confusion.

If there were no autonomy or freedom of action bestowed by neutrality, no action could be taken before a cease-fire came into effect and steps were taken to restore order or keep the peace; in other words it would have to be renounced at the very time — which could last for years — when the fighting is in its most deadly phase, when international forces are paralysed and when apolitical agencies, tolerated by the belligerents on account of their neutrality and the strictly humanitarian nature of their work, are the victims' last possible recourse.

Humanitarian action

Does Resolution 43/131 enshrine a new and official recognition of a right to humanitarian assistance, a right that is no longer subject to the political and territorial control of States? Will the community of emergency relief agencies be better served than in the past by the adoption of that resolution?

1. The legal background

We cannot but be astonished by the gulf between the intentions displayed and the wording of Resolution 43/131, which is certainly a stringent reminder of the principle of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and of "their primary role in the organization, coordination and implementation of humanitarian assistance within their respective territories". Moreover, the official stances taken by States when the draft resolution was submitted to the General Assembly left no doubt as to the interpretation they intended to place on it and the margin of manoeuvre being left to the non-governmental organizations.

It can be said without hesitation that the text of Resolution 43/131 falls short of the provisions of the Geneva Conventions and the Additional Protocols on the right to assistance. Whatever may have been suggested, those provisions are specific, binding on States and based on a scrupulous analysis of the various conflict situations that generate material needs (blockades, military occupations, internal and international conflicts, etc.).

Admittedly, the entire construction is still formally subject to the consent of States; but States have no discretionary right to deny assistance to civilian populations when offered by a neutral and impartial body. The legal hurdle is therefore a relative one in that States assume precise and imperative obligations in that respect.

Moreover, it is worth adding that the lawmakers who handed down the Protocols were careful to stipulate that offers of relief “shall not be regarded as interference in the armed conflict or as unfriendly acts”.⁶ That principle is an important one because it confirms the legitimacy and legality of humanitarian initiative in all circumstances, even where it runs counter to reasons of state.

It is consequently somewhat specious to make out that the difficulties encountered in the field result from an inadequacy of the available texts. In almost all cases the crux of the matter is in fact the difficulty experienced by States in respecting their commitments when in situations of conflict.

It is thus clear that the best way to tackle these political problems is again bound up with the ability of the humanitarian community to present a unified front based on precise and unequivocal legal references. The main effect of the multiplicity of texts, the formal value and content of which vary considerably, is therefore to sow confusion over the obligations contracted by States and lead to more frequent deviation from them.

2. Dealing with emergencies

One of the major restrictions to traditional humanitarian action is said to be its self-imposed ban on crossing the frontiers of States which refuse it permission to operate. This has become a familiar refrain since the Biafra affair, in which the ICRC, while remaining operational at all times, temporarily had to suspend its relief consignments. The conclusion drawn is thus obvious: emergencies and the need for speedy access to victims call for the freeing of humanitarian action from political red-tape and obstruction; and if the result cannot be achieved by legal or diplomatic means, there is nothing against recourse to clandestine measures.

Unfortunately, examples of this kind are in plentiful supply: whatever the legal position, experience clearly shows that there can be no rapid and efficient action in the field without the explicit consent of the States concerned and the armed forces on the spot. If such support is withheld, large-scale operations carried out with modern means, usually destined for hundreds of thousands of victims and required over months if not years, are simply inconceivable.

⁶ Protocol I, Article 70.

Negotiations with the States concerned, in which the humanitarian aspect cannot be overlooked, must be an ongoing process: the legal and fiscal facilities which the ICRC enjoyed during most of the famine in Ethiopia were negotiated as early as 1982. Facilities for intervening from Baghdad into the Shiite south of Iraq, and across the lines into Kurdistan, were for the most part granted to the ICRC thanks to contacts established and permanently maintained since 1980. In the same way, the agreements giving access to prisoners and guaranteeing certain facilities for the ICRC's work in Yugoslavia were signed and became operational three years before the crisis came to a head in Slovenia in July 1991. So it is diplomatic groundwork, and not the romanticism purveyed by the media, which opens the door to immediate emergency action.

And beyond relief?

The thinking on humanitarian action is often clouded by the more spectacular and immediately perceptible aspect of the suffering and needs of the victims. Hence the exclusive cult of relief supplies and emergency medical aid. Humanitarian work is thus reduced to a logistic and technical problem.

As we have seen, Resolution 43/131 is the expression of such logic: it is designed to address "natural disasters and similar emergencies" and is polarized around access to victims; it also deals exclusively with assistance. In our view, that approach obscures the real and often priority needs of victims and confines action solely to treating the symptoms.

War anywhere is first and foremost an institutional disaster, the breakdown of legal systems, a circumstance in which rights are secured by force. Everyone who has experienced war, particularly the wars of our times, knows that unleashed violence means the obliteration of standards of behaviour and legal systems. Humanitarian action in a war situation is therefore above all a legal approach which precedes and accompanies the actual provision of relief. Protecting victims means giving them a status, goods and the infrastructure indispensable for survival, and setting up monitoring bodies. In other words the idea is to persuade belligerents to accept an exceptional legal order — the law of war or humanitarian law — specially tailored to such situations. That is precisely why humanitarian action is inconceivable without close and permanent dialogue with the parties to the conflict.

Secondly, war implies a weakening of sovereignty, a questioning of territorial integrity and a hardening of policy extending to all aspects of civilian life. Whether it be a matter of freeing prisoners of the propaganda war, negotiating exchanges or repatriations at the end of the conflict, conferring neutral status on a front-line hospital or feeding or evacuating civilians, the first thing is always to take the field of humanitarian action out of its political context. The law is not enough to enable agreements to be reached in the field; the humanitarian negotiator's main asset is to be credited with trustworthy intentions, a neutral and strictly impartial role and the ability to act as a neutral intermediary between the belligerents.

Lastly, war is not only the instant when law breaks down and power is called into question; above all, it is the ensuing maelstrom of violence and the sum total of incalculable and ever-increasing suffering.

It is precisely to cope coherently with the multiple aggressions of war that the ICRC has sought to develop an operational approach which incorporates all the specialized services and action to be undertaken in order to respond to all victims and all the wounds inflicted on humankind in time of war.

It is in that respect that law, diplomacy and field work constitute an interdependent whole. For no assistance can be extended to the civilian population for long without the independence and neutrality which guarantee the impartiality of the aid being offered to the populations of the belligerents. The right to medical or material assistance counts for nothing if there are no rules on the conduct of hostilities to outlaw famine and the destruction of civilian property as methods of warfare. Work in prisoner-of-war camps has generally had a decisive effect on the conduct of the armed forces, particularly towards civilians. The search for missing persons, family reunification and the exchanging of messages between people separated or isolated by war also have their effects long after the cessation of active hostilities, when the time comes to solve the myriad problems of restoring peace.

The ICRC has formed the conviction that those approaches must be combined in a consistent whole if humanitarian action in wartime is to be not only effective but above all feasible and credible in the eyes of the belligerents.

Frédéric Maurice

Assistance to victims of war in international humanitarian law and humanitarian practice

To crown the feature on humanitarian assistance published in the May-June 1992 issue of the Review, we now present the text of a lecture given by ICRC President Cornelio Sommaruga in several European cities in recent months, among them Freiburg im Breisgau, Como, Oslo and Paris.

Speaking on the subject "Assistance to victims of war in international humanitarian law and humanitarian practice", Mr. Sommaruga addressed people from the realms of politics and economics, the academic world and the Red Cross. He strongly reaffirmed the importance of the Fundamental Principles of the Red Cross and the Red Crescent — above all those of impartiality, neutrality and independence — on which the humanitarian work of the ICRC is based. Using examples from recent conflicts, he demonstrated that respect for these principles is the best guarantee for credibility and effectiveness in humanitarian aid. Apart from anything else, this is an eloquent reply to those who are tempted to mix politics with humanitarianism.

* * *

Last year's events in the Middle East and Yugoslavia have directed public awareness — finally, I would say — to the difficulty of providing efficient *assistance* to the victims of armed conflict. Consciousness of these difficulties has set in motion a discussion which unfortunately demonstrates how little the public has so far been prepared to grapple seriously with this question.

The problem has existed since the beginning of humanitarian aid. In the 129 years of its existence, the International Committee of the Red Cross has again and again had the painful experience that victims of wars and persecutions have waited in vain for assistance from the Red Cross. The impossibility during the last World War of helping the

millions of people persecuted and murdered by the Nazis has indeed been the most traumatic experience of our history. But even after World War II tragedies have taken place again and again without humanitarian organizations being able to intervene. In Tibet and Burma, for example, ICRC delegates are still refused access to areas of conflict, and in Sudan, in Ethiopia and quite recently in Iran, the ICRC has had to interrupt its work because the authorities have refused it entry to the war zones or to the camps of prisoners of war.

The official reasons given for the reluctance of holders of political and military power to allow humanitarian assistance range from reference to the sovereignty of the State and security considerations to the statement that sufficient aid is already available and that no outside help is needed, not to mention bureaucratic objections. In most cases, however, these reasons conceal the concern of military and political authorities that humanitarian helpers and unwelcome witnesses will hinder the prosecution of war, the means of which are considered effective but not necessarily praiseworthy.

The refusal of certain governments to accept offers of aid thus does not stem from fear of material help, which on the contrary would often be extremely welcome, but can be attributed to a frequently neglected but basic aspect of humanitarian assistance, in particular in war situations or those of political tension, namely the *protection* that assistance inevitably entails. To provide assistance without protection would be absurd. What is the point of providing medicine to wounded people in a hospital if that same hospital is being bombarded? Why give a refugee food if immediately afterwards he is sent back home across minefields? What use is a bar of soap to a prisoner undergoing torture? Access to the victims of war must allow action on their behalf, on the one hand providing them with the necessary material assistance, but on the other hand also protecting them from those dangers which prolong and aggravate their suffering.

Thanks to the founders of the Red Cross this close *interrelationship* between protection and assistance has been clearly recognized. It was laid down for the first time in the 1864 Geneva Conventions, which established the right of the war-wounded to care and protection and the right of those caring for them to be free to work unharmed and unimpeded. Article 5 of this Convention even stipulates that "the presence of any wounded combatant receiving shelter and care in a house shall ensure its protection". In this way, victims of war became bearers of a right to be protected, which was also transferred to those caring for them. The visible sign of this right to protection was a red cross. It is important that the *red cross emblem* should not, as often

happens, be misunderstood as being purely a symbol of assistance and therefore wrongly used. It is first and foremost a symbol of protection and its use for other purposes jeopardizes its protective function.

After the first-ever Geneva Convention was adopted in 1864, the protection of *international humanitarian law* was progressively extended, based on experiences in the major wars of this century, to other categories of victims of war. One after another, specific international agreements were concluded covering sick, wounded and shipwrecked victims of naval warfare, prisoners of war and civilians. All these were combined after the Second World War in a single set of treaties, the four Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949. The emergence of new forms of warfare and the development of new military and civilian technologies continue to demand the adaptation of international humanitarian law to new threats. For example, Protocol I of 1977 additional to the Geneva Conventions takes account for the first time of the threat posed to the natural environment by war and prohibits attacks on dams, dykes and nuclear power stations. Additional Protocol II of 1977 closed a further gap, for with the exception of Article 3 common to all four Geneva Conventions, the latter's provisions are binding only in the event of armed conflict between States. Under Protocol II, certain arrangements for assistance and protection to the victims of hostilities must now also be made by the Parties to *internal* armed conflict.

In recent years, discussions on humanitarian aid have focused not least on the demand that a "*right to intervene on humanitarian grounds*" ("*le droit d'ingérence humanitaire*") be created. Claiming this right to intervene — or to interfere — is to demand a paradox. Neither so-called "common sense" nor ethical considerations allow us to view the assistance which we provide to persons in need as an unjustified interference — on the contrary: *providing assistance is a duty*. Every philosophical and religious tradition contains texts to impress this obligation upon us, beginning with the Good Samaritan of Christian tradition.

International humanitarian law likewise does not view help as interference. The Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols contain more than twenty provisions on medical and other material assistance to which victims of armed conflict are entitled.

For example, Article 70 of Additional Protocol I states clearly in relation to aid to civilian populations in need that "Offers of such relief shall not be regarded as interference in the armed conflict or as unfriendly acts. (...) The Parties to the conflict and each High Contracting Party shall allow and facilitate the rapid and unimpeded

passage of all relief consignments, equipment and personnel (...) even if such assistance is destined for the civilian population of the adverse Party". What are the *conditions* which govern the entitlement to unimpeded assistance? There are two: the actual needs of the civilian population and the humanitarian and impartial nature of the assistance. While it is true that under the same Article 70, relief operations require the consent of the State concerned, the context and the discussion on the formulation of these provisions at the 1974-1977 Diplomatic Conference nonetheless clearly show that consent must be given if the above-mentioned conditions are met. In this way, consent becomes an expression of the sovereignty of the State, which is thereby fulfilling obligations it has accepted, for by ratifying the Geneva Conventions the Contracting Parties have undertaken, in the free exercise of their sovereign rights, to respect the *right of victims to be assisted*.

The consent of the authorities in an area in which a humanitarian operation is being conducted also has a very practical value, for how can one in actual fact impose assistance on a country — in an area controlled by the government — against its will? Or how is it possible to provide this help, in all its cultural, social, logistic and administrative aspects, without the cooperation of the local people in command or even against their resistance?

I wish to stress this latter point: it is not the formal consent of the government that we seek to go somewhere in the country where it is not in control. In such cases we require the consent of those exerting effective power in the specific region where there are humanitarian needs.

There is of course one answer if there is no consent, namely by force. And the much-publicized "Provide Comfort" operation carried out one year ago in Iraqi Kurdistan is an example of this. However, any armed intervention, even for reputedly humanitarian purposes, gives rise to doubts as to its genuinely humanitarian and impartial character. Such doubts are but accentuated by the slogan of "humanitarian interference" and appear to confirm a suspicion, long held by many recipients of humanitarian aid, as to whether the help so generously given is really disinterested? Is it not rather a particularly artful, indeed devious form of political intervention? The historical experience of southern countries has various times confirmed the justification of this suspicion. How often in the past have settlers, preachers and whole armies overrun those countries, with joyous tidings on their lips and greed for power and riches in their hearts!

And yet there is a *right of victims to humanitarian assistance* and a duty for all of us to provide this help. In international humanitarian law States recognize this right and duty and set the rules by which they must be fulfilled. The simple, basic rule for assistance to victims of armed conflict is that the assistance must be provided in an impartial manner by a neutral, independent organization. Almost everywhere that this stipulation appears in the Geneva Conventions, mention of the *neutral organization* is accompanied by the words “such as the International Committee of the Red Cross”. Indeed, in the eyes of the framers of the 1949 Conventions the activities of the ICRC set the supreme example for humanitarian action. This is really rather surprising when one considers that the ICRC was founded as a private institution, all of whose members and the majority of whose delegates and other staff are Swiss. The development from being a private club to becoming a subject of international law is not, however, the result of chance, skilful public relations or political influence. Rather it is the outcome of the ICRC’s unceasing, practical work in the world’s war zones. From the battlefields in Schleswig-Holstein in 1864 until today, for example in the civil war in Somalia or in Nagorno-Karabakh, the ICRC has developed an expertise in humanitarian action which is unique in its kind. This is backed by the experience of thousands of delegates and by theoretical discussion, critical debate and careful consideration within the Committee itself. This humanitarian mission and its success would have been inconceivable without the moral and material support of the entire International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement with its meanwhile 151 National Societies.

The bases for this humanitarian action lie in the *Fundamental Principles of the Red Cross and the Red Crescent*: humanity, impartiality, neutrality, independence, voluntary service, unity and universality. Three of these principles are particularly important for such action, namely impartiality, neutrality and independence.

Independence forms the basis of the ICRC’s neutral and impartial work. The ICRC is independent of other international organizations, and of governments, pressure groups and business enterprises. Maintaining this independence is not easy. It involves withstanding the attempts of donor nation governments to gain influence and the greater or lesser pressure exerted by the parties to an armed conflict, in order to be able to work according to exclusively humanitarian criteria. The importance of credible independence is clearly evident in the ICRC’s role as a neutral humanitarian intermediary. Protection and assistance to the victims of war are given between battlefronts, in no man’s land, and in disputed territory. The evacuation of injured persons from a

besieged town, visits to prisoners of war or the distribution of relief supplies to inhabitants of an occupied area must be negotiated by the ICRC delegates with all parties to an armed conflict. Delegates themselves travel to the areas of conflict to determine needs, accompany the consignments of relief supplies and distribute them to the recipients. All this is possible only if the ICRC's independence is credible to our negotiating partners, and to all military and political powers in our area of action.

Let me take *Iraq* as an example to illustrate the importance of this credibility. After the UN's imposition of the embargo and threat of military intervention, the representatives of most international organizations and the diplomats of most States gradually withdrew from Baghdad. The ICRC kept its delegation there throughout the entire Gulf War. Whilst the anti-Iraq Coalition and the Western media were reporting a quick, clean war against Saddam Hussein, the ICRC continued to warn about the distressing consequences of armed intervention, calling on the parties to the conflict to respect international humanitarian law. When the suffering of the civilian population following the international war and the uprisings in the south and the north of the country became known, ICRC delegates were already on the spot: they knew the country and the people, at whose side they had endured the war, and they knew the different persons in command. And the authorities knew the ICRC: independent of the powers which had waged the war against Iraq, independent of the United Nations, which had declared the embargo, independent of the Swiss Government, which had autonomously aligned itself with the UN sanctions, but an ICRC which was ready to act. The first shipments of aid reached Baghdad whilst the war was still continuing, and when the question how to help the hundreds of thousands of displaced Kurds arose, the first delegates — with the consent of the Iraqi authorities — set off for the mountains of Kurdistan to survey the situation and deliver the first relief supplies. Aid by the Allies — against Iraqi resistance — conversely had to be brought in using enormous military resources and in very difficult logistic conditions. The ICRC, with the help of personnel from West European Red Cross Societies, is still there to this day, working alongside UNHCR operations — conducted under the protection of UN guards.

What is the position of the *National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies* as regards independence? This fundamental principle, which is defined by the Statutes of the International Red Cross, states explicitly that the National Societies, while auxiliaries in the humanitarian services of their governments and subject to the laws of their respec-

tive countries, must always maintain their autonomy so that they may be able at all times to act in accordance with the Red Cross principles. This also places a major responsibility on the governments of States party to the Geneva Conventions (today numbering 170) since they, together with the 151 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, adopted the present Statutes of the International Red Cross in 1986. These stipulate that "the States shall at all times respect the adherence by all the components of the Movement to the Fundamental Principles".

Needless to say, independence at the national level is just as indispensable. If the Red Cross were not able to decide for itself, speak for itself and act of its own volition, it would not be what it is. Its task is constantly to show the way of compassion and justice. It must at all times be able to be true to its humanitarian ideals and apply its own principles. The Red Cross must, without fail, inspire confidence in every man and woman throughout the world, including those who are powerless, those who most need its protection and assistance.

The National Societies must above all show independence *vis-à-vis* the political authorities in their country. They too must resist any political interference in their decision-making bodies. In practice, this means that any post held within the Red Cross must be entirely distinct from other political or administrative responsibilities, just as the Society itself must remain a private and autonomous institution.

The International Committee must be able to count on the independence of the National Societies. Maintaining independence means above all avoiding any politicization of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. This is the only way to maintain the credibility of its neutral and impartial humanitarian work as a whole. On a worldwide scale, the Movement has one single image: it is the Red Cross. If even one National Society fails to live up to the standards I have mentioned, the entire Movement suffers. Thus, the credibility of the International Committee and its humanitarian work can depend on the true autonomy of one single National Society, and vice versa.

The second basic principle for effective humanitarian assistance is neutrality. The concept of neutrality has changed meaning somewhat in recent history and is today often misunderstood. For the Red Cross, neutrality means non-intervention in political discussions, the refusal to take a stance on political issues. For the ICRC, working in the context of political disputes which can flare into armed combat, neutrality is quite simply the only possible way of preserving the necessary scope for humanitarian action.

Neutrality does not however mean indifference to circumstances and in particular to the consequences of conflicts. On the contrary, neutrality is a means of defending humanitarian concerns with even greater conviction. The neutrality of the ICRC is different from that of a State — including that of Switzerland — it is a code of conduct which must be observed without fail at all times if the ICRC is to accomplish its objectives and discharge its international mandate.

The specific neutrality and independence of the ICRC are also legally recognized in the Geneva Conventions and in the Statutes of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. They are further guaranteed by the strict procedure of cooptation of the members of the International Committee, the governing body of the ICRC, in secret ballots and by a qualified majority. Its single nationality is yet another important token of independence and efficiency. The fact that it is exclusively Swiss is in my view less important, but well understood because of the historic initiative taken by five Geneva citizens in 1863, entirely independently of the Swiss Government, who wished to build up the new institution on a private basis. I believe that there is at present no valid alternative to a mononational ICRC with a coopted governing body composed of Swiss citizens, if it is to discharge its mandate as a specifically neutral humanitarian intermediary efficiently and in complete independence.

Let me give you an example in which the neutrality of words is conducive to the effectiveness of deeds, and how we do not decide who is right or wrong, but act when someone does wrong. Let me speak of Yugoslavia. In the war between Croatia and Serbia, an intensive propaganda campaign is being waged about alleged — and real — violations of human rights and international humanitarian law. The parties to the conflict are accusing each other of the most terrible massacres, of torture and deportations. The ICRC, however, acts: it attempts wherever possible to be on the spot when civilians get caught up in the war, it visits prisoners and organizes their release. It has called on the parties to the conflict to protect the civilian population, but has also intervened directly and very specifically with the military and political authorities when the rules of international law were being flouted. On several occasions it has furthermore brought the representatives of the parties to the conflict together around a table in Geneva to devise concrete suggestions for solving serious problems of humanitarian concern. As a result, the parties have agreed on procedures to search for missing persons and to transmit and investigate allegations of breaches of international law. In this way, instruments have been created that lead out of the vicious circle of accusation and retaliation,

render negotiation possible and — who knows — mark a first step towards a defusing of the confrontation. A fourth meeting of this kind, chaired by the ICRC and attended by representatives of Serbia, Croatia, the Yugoslav Federal Army and the Federal Government, took place at ministerial level (including army generals) in Geneva in March 1992.

Our third principle is *impartiality*. This means that the protection and assistance of the Red Cross must be given without consideration of political, social, ethnic or ideological criteria and only with regard to actual needs. Impartiality means providing human beings with protection and assistance because they are human beings, and not because they belong to any specific category. All victims are entitled to the same assistance, and nobody can be excluded. This principle at times demands a certain toughness when it has to be enforced. Parties to an armed conflict will often accept aid for parts of a population which are politically close to them, whilst not allowing assistance for “enemy” or “unworthy” sections of the population. In these cases the question arises as to whether one should give help wherever possible and hope thereby to earn goodwill for helping later wherever needed? For example, during the Iraqi occupation of *Kuwait*, i.e. from 2 August 1990, the Iraqi authorities were apparently ready, after hard negotiations, to allow ICRC delegates to evaluate needs and provide assistance everywhere except in Kuwait. However, the population of the occupied territory that Kuwait had become not only had major needs, but also a vested right to the protection of the ICRC, and it was unacceptable to exclude them in particular from assistance. For this reason, until the end of the occupation of Kuwait the ICRC had to confront the Iraqi Government with the alternative that either aid would be provided for everyone or for no one. We did depart from this admittedly strict position during the bombardment of Baghdad, in order to provide Iraqi hospitals with emergency aid (medical supplies and in particular drinking water).

As you can see, humanitarian assistance is a balancing act in which effective protection and active assistance depend on credible impartiality and independence. That such assistance is possible is demonstrated by the worldwide activity of the International Committee of the Red Cross. More than eight hundred delegates and other expatriate staff and 5,000 local employees are currently working to help the victims of some thirty conflicts. These include many staff members seconded to us by Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies for specific assignments. In areas on the edge of war zones we are moreover

currently running 13 surgical hospitals and 26 orthopaedic centres for the rehabilitation of amputees.

In 1991, not only were 89,000 tonnes of food worth more than \$100 million plus medical and other relief supplies worth \$25 million distributed in war zones; 153,759 prisoners of war and detainees were also visited. And the fact that these activities were carried out with the agreement of the parties to armed conflicts demonstrates the extent of the trust placed by the political and military authorities of these countries in the independence and neutrality of the ICRC. But although failures and temporary setbacks can admittedly occur at any moment — as in Iran today — that is no reason to give way to the politization of humanitarian action.

We do believe in the possibility and the effectiveness of humanitarian action and of international humanitarian law. They serve as an essential basis for countering the threat posed to mankind by war, injustice and sickness. However, the Red Cross needs the *convinced and active support of the public and the community of nations*.

With regard to humanitarian work this means, on the one hand, that we need political and material support, and on the other hand that our *political independence* must be guaranteed. At a time when the world is dividing more and more clearly into two political blocks, the affluent North and the indigent South, humanitarian institutions must not be used to promote the power or economic policy of the wealthy *vis-à-vis* the poor, but must be an instrument expressing true solidarity between human beings.

Cornelio Sommaruga
President
International Committee
of the Red Cross

REGULATIONS FOR THE FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE MEDAL

Following the postponement of the 26th International Conference, the Council of Delegates, meeting in Budapest in November 1991, adopted the amended version of the Regulations for the Florence Nightingale Medal.

The amended text redefines the criteria for the award of the medal and does away with the adverse distinction drawn between men and women exercising the same profession. Indeed, until the Regulations were amended, the medal could be awarded exclusively to women.

On 31 January 1992, the ICRC submitted the revised Regulations to the States party to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 for their approval and set a deadline of six months for them to make known any objections, failing which the new Regulations would be considered as having been adopted.

As the deadline passed without any objections being raised, the revised Regulations came into force on 3 August 1992.

The new Regulations read as follows:

Regulations for the Florence Nightingale Medal

*amended text adopted by the Council of Delegates
(Budapest, 1991)*

Article 1

In accordance with the recommendation of the 8th International Conference of the Red Cross held in London in 1907, and the decision of the 9th International Conference held in Washington in 1912, a Fund was established by contributions from National Societies of the Red Cross in memory of the great and distinguished services of Florence Nightingale for the improvement of the care of wounded and sick.

The income of the Fund shall be used for the distribution of a Medal, to be called the «Florence Nightingale Medal», to honour the spirit which marked the whole life and work of Florence Nightingale.

Article 2

The Florence Nightingale Medal may be awarded to qualified male or female nurses and also to male or female voluntary nursing aides who are active members or regular helpers of a National Red Cross or Red Crescent Society or of an affiliated medical or nursing institution.

The Medal may be awarded to those of the above-mentioned persons who have distinguished themselves in time of peace or war by:

- exceptional courage and devotion to the wounded, sick or disabled or to civilian victims of a conflict or disaster,*
- exemplary services or a creative and pioneering spirit in the areas of public health or nursing education.*

The Medal may be awarded posthumously if the prospective recipient has fallen on active service.

Article 3

The Medal shall be awarded by the International Committee of the Red Cross on proposals made to it by National Societies.

Article 4

The Medal shall be in silver-gilt with a portrait on the obverse of Florence Nightingale with the words «Ad memoriam Florence Nightingale 1820-1910». On the reverse it shall bear the inscription on the circumference «Pro vera misericordia et cara humanitate perennis decor universalis». The name of the holder and the date of the award of the Medal shall be engraved in the centre.

The Medal shall be attached by a red and white ribbon to a laurel crown surrounding a red cross.

The Medal shall be accompanied by a diploma on parchment.

Article 5

The Medal shall be presented in each country either by the Head of the State, or by the President of the Central Committee of the National Society directly or by their substitutes.

The ceremony shall take place with a solemnity consistent with the distinction of the honour conferred.

Article 6

The distribution of the Florence Nightingale Medal shall take place every two years.

Not more than 50 Medals may be issued at any one distribution.

If by reason of exceptional circumstances due to a widespread state of war it has been impossible for one or more distributions to take place, the number of Medals awarded at subsequent distributions may exceed the figure of 50 but may not exceed the total number which would normally have been attained, if the preceding distributions had been able to take place.

Article 7

From the beginning of September of the year preceding the year in which the Medal is awarded, the International Committee of the Red Cross shall invite the Central Committees of the National Societies by means of a circular and application forms to submit the names of the candidates they consider qualified to be awarded a Medal, in accordance with the conditions mentioned in Article 2.

Article 8

The Central Committees of the National Societies, having taken all requisite advice, shall submit to the International Committee of the Red Cross the names and qualifications of the candidates they propose.

To enable the International Committee to operate a fair selection, the candidates' names shall be accompanied by all relevant information justifying an award of the Medal, in accordance with the criteria mentioned in Article 2.

All applications submitted must come from the Central Committee of a National Society.

The Central Committees may submit one or more applications, but are not bound to submit applications for each distribution.

Article 9

The applications with the reasons in support of them must reach the International Committee of the Red Cross before 1 March of the year in which the award of the Medal is to take place.

Applications reaching the International Committee after that date cannot be considered except in connection with a subsequent award.

Article 10

The International Committee of the Red Cross retains complete freedom of choice. It may refrain from awarding the total number of Medals contemplated, if the qualifications of the applicants submitted do not appear to merit this distinguished honour.

Article 11

The International Committee of the Red Cross shall issue on the anniversary of the birth of Florence Nightingale, namely on 12 May, a circular informing the Central Committees of the National Societies of the names of those to whom the Medal has been awarded.

Article 12

The present Regulations, adopted by the Council of Delegates in Budapest in 1991, supersede all previous rules relating to the Florence Nightingale Medal, in particular those of the 9th International Conference (Washington, 1912), the Regulations of 24 December 1913 and the amendments to the latter by the 10th Conference (Geneva, 1921), the 13th Conference (The Hague, 1928), the 15th Conference (Tokyo, 1934), the 18th Conference (Toronto, 1952) and the 24th Conference (Manila, 1981).

Missions by the President

- In the second half of May 1992, ICRC President Cornelio Sommaruga went to **The Hague** to attend the IVth Regional Conference of European National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (18-22 May), which took as its theme "The New Europe needs The New Red Cross" (see pp. 391-393). While in The Hague, Mr. Sommaruga had talks with the Netherlands Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Minister for Cooperation Development on various current ICRC operations and on financial matters. The President thanked the government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands for its substantial support for the ICRC in the past and for its commitment to providing financial help in the future. During a working meeting at the Foreign Ministry with officials dealing with various geographical regions and with multilateral cooperation, the prospects for reconvening the 26th International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent were reviewed. The President also had the opportunity, at a lunch given by the Swiss Ambassador to the Netherlands, to talk to the President of the Second Chamber of the Netherlands Parliament and to the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs about humanitarian needs around the world and the degree of respect shown for international humanitarian law. Mr. Sommaruga was accompanied by Mr. Maurice Aubert, a member of the ICRC, Mr. Yves Sandoz, Director, and Mr. Michel Convers, Deputy Director.
- At the end of May, Mr. Sommaruga visited a major international exhibition in **Genoa** entitled "Christopher Columbus, Ships and the Sea". At the invitation of the Italian government and the Italian Red Cross, the ICRC had mounted a stand explaining the origins and development of humanitarian law, with special reference to the Second Geneva Convention (for the amelioration of the condition of wounded, sick and shipwrecked members of armed forces at sea). The ICRC President inaugurated the stand on 26 May and then attended various events organized by the Italian Red Cross, including an exhibition entitled "The Italian Red Cross and the

Sea". The following day, Mr. Sommaruga visited the Italian Red Cross Museum in Campomorone, near Genoa (see pp. 393-396).

- On 13 June the President went to **Solothurn** to attend the 107th Assembly of the Swiss Red Cross. In an address he referred to Max Huber's maxim *res non verba* (action not words) and called upon the Movement to present a united front, to preserve the special nature of each of its components and to uphold the Red Cross principles in order to face the challenges of the modern world. He stressed the importance of young people and the need for frank acknowledgement of the weaknesses of the Red Cross. He concluded with an appeal for humanitarian mobilization; this, he said, could be achieved by more effective dissemination of humanitarian law and the Fundamental Principles of the Movement.
- On 19 June 1992 in **Nice**, the ICRC President was awarded an honorary doctorate by the University of Nice-Sophia Antipolis, as a tribute to the ICRC's humanitarian work. The award ceremony was presided over by Professor Michel Bornancin, President of the University of Nice-Sophia Antipolis, and attended by Crown Prince Albert of Monaco, Professor André Delaude, President of the French Red Cross, Professor Maurice Torrelli, Dean of the Institute of Peace and Development Law, and Dr. Jean-Claude Vaillaud, Chairman of the French Red Cross Departmental Council for Alpes-Maritimes.

In his address, entitled "Ensuring respect for international humanitarian law - a constant challenge for the ICRC", Mr. Sommaruga described the development of international humanitarian law since the founding of the Red Cross. He went on to stress that the world could no longer tolerate a situation in which the fate of victims of armed conflict depended on the whim of the belligerents. Given the scale of the fighting that was currently devastating many countries, the ICRC President proposed that the States party to the Geneva Conventions should be convened at regular intervals and reminded of their obligation to meet their humanitarian commitments.

The President, who was also received by the Mayor of the City of Nice and by the the Alpes-Maritimes Red Cross, was accompanied by Mrs. Renée Guisan and Mr. Max Daetwyler, members of the ICRC, and Mr. André Pasquier, special adviser.

MEETING ON AID FOR VICTIMS OF THE CONFLICT IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

(Geneva, 29 July 1992)

The magnitude of the refugee problem in the former Yugoslavia, unprecedented in Europe since the Second World War, prompted the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to convene an international meeting in Geneva on 29 July 1992 aimed at mobilizing support for some 2,300,000 people who have fled the fighting since the beginning of the Yugoslav crisis in 1991.

The meeting was presided over by Swiss Federal Councillor Arnold Koller. The representatives of 86 countries and of various intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations attending the meeting heard statements by Mr. Jan Eliasson, UN Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs, Mrs. Sadako Ogata, UN High Commissioner for Refugees, and Mr. Cornelio Sommaruga, President of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

After denouncing what he called "a deliberate plan based on the exclusion of other groups", the ICRC President stated in particular: "I am referring, of course, to the terrible ravages of 'ethnic cleansing', in whose name whole populations are being terrorized, minorities intimidated and harassed, civilians interned on a massive scale, hostages taken, and torture, deportation and summary executions are rife. Such methods, which we thought had been consigned to museums showing the horrors of the Second World War, have become almost common practice in the war-torn territory of what was Yugoslavia."

Noting that despite the ICRC's numerous public appeals and confidential approaches at all levels and to all the parties, breaches of international humanitarian law and of human rights had become almost commonplace, especially as regards the civilian population, Mr. Sommaruga called on the States to use every means at their disposal to seek a political settlement to the conflict. The ICRC, for its part,

pledged to pursue its emergency operations for all victims of the tragedy and to spare no effort in promoting dialogue on humanitarian issues among the parties concerned.

* * *

In another development in Geneva the same day, Mr. Milan Panić, Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and Mr. Mate Granić, Vice Prime Minister of the Republic of Croatia, signed an agreement under ICRC auspices providing for the release and repatriation of all prisoners still held in connection with the Croatian conflict.

The agreement stated that, in accordance with Article 118 of the Third Geneva Convention and with the agreements reached at ICRC headquarters on 6 November 1991, about 1,200 prisoners were to be released unconditionally by both parties.

In the Red Cross and Red Crescent World

EUROPEAN REGIONAL CONFERENCE

“THE NEW EUROPE NEEDS THE NEW RED CROSS”

(The Hague, 18-22 May 1992)

The IVth Regional Conference of European National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies was held in The Hague from 18 to 22 May 1992. Organized by the Netherlands Red Cross, which this year celebrates its 125th anniversary, the Conference, meeting for the first time since 1981 (in Budapest), was attended by some 200 representatives from 48 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. Participants included delegates from 12 National Societies of the former Soviet Union, who were attending their first international gathering as independent societies, as well as the representatives of the three Baltic Societies and the nascent Red Cross of Malta. The ICRC was present at the conference with observer status.

The theme of the conference was “The new Europe needs the new Red Cross”. Participants were invited to consider the impact on the structure and work of European National Societies of the radical political, economic and social changes which have taken place in many countries of Europe.

The Conference was opened on 18 May by the Prime Minister of the Netherlands, Mr. Ruud F.M. Lubbers, who urged delegates to oppose violence and to build a society where every individual is equally valued. The Movement “can play an important role in fostering democracy and peaceful coexistence in the new Europe”, he told his audience, which included HRH Princess Margriet, Vice-President of the Netherlands Red Cross, and HRH Princess Juliana, its Patron.

At the beginning of the proceedings, on 20 May, came the news of the death of ICRC delegate Frédéric Maurice. In response to the suggestion by the President of the Netherlands Red Cross and Chairman of the conference, Mr. J.J. van der Weel, the Assembly adopted a message of condolence from the members of the conference to the families of those who have been killed in recent months in the accomplishment of their humanitarian mission and expressing their “profound admiration for all the delegates and other persons

who have, under ever more dangerous conditions, become involved in humanitarian activities, serving the Movement's ideals".

The President of the ICRC, after paying a tribute to ICRC delegates who are the victims of frequent security incidents, expressed the view that the new Europe needed a Red Cross stimulated by a new humanitarian impetus and motivated by true solidarity. Once again, he called for humanitarian mobilization, to be brought about by spreading knowledge of the fundamental principles of the Movement and the basic rules of international humanitarian law. Commenting further that any politicization or loss of independence of National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies inevitably undermined the international credibility of the emblem, Mr. Sommaruga placed special emphasis on the need to be more strict with regard to the use of the emblem and to apply the relevant regulations to the letter.

The work of the Conference was assigned to three Commissions. Commission I, chaired by Mr. Haakan Hellberg (Finnish Red Cross), dealt with health and social welfare, AIDS and blood transfusion.

Commission II, under the chairmanship of Mrs. Carmen Mestre Vergara (Spanish Red Cross), considered matters relating to recruitment of members, voluntary work, youth, fund-raising and dissemination of the principles of the Movement and of humanitarian law.

Lastly, questions relating to the environment, technological disasters, cross-border operations, refugees and displaced persons were discussed in Commission III, with Mr. Rezso Sztuchlik (Hungarian Red Cross) as Chairman.

A number of resolutions were adopted by the three Commissions and endorsed by the Conference. The need to develop the work of National Societies in the areas of health, social work, blood transfusion, the fight against AIDS and programmes for refugees, asylum seekers, displaced persons or returnees was reaffirmed. National Societies were urged, *inter alia*, to give priority in their programmes to the most vulnerable groups of the population, to help the new National Societies in eastern Europe to develop strategies in the above areas, and to strengthen their cooperation with relevant international and national institutions.

How can the work of the local youth groups be made relevant to the needs in their communities? How can other young people from different levels in society be informed of the role of the Movement and inspired to join in its work? What kind of training and support do young people need to ensure their effective involvement in decision-making at a local, regional and national level of their Societies? These are the questions that will be discussed at the Youth Summit, to be held in Austria from 12 to 26 July 1992. The National Societies and the Federation are called upon to act on the recommendations of the Summit.

With regard to voluntary work, National Societies were recommended, *inter alia*, to provide adequate training and continuous professional back-up and support to the volunteers providing services, or participating in other activities or in policy-making.

The Conference, particularly dismayed by the many instances of disregard for humanitarian law and indignant at deliberate attacks on persons and property bearing the Red Cross or Red Crescent emblem, adopted a resolution calling upon "the responsible authorities of the armed forces to do their utmost to ensure respect for international humanitarian law, to teach its basic guidelines to the combatants and to severely repress these violations" and expressing "its support for and solidarity with the ICRC in this particularly sensitive time for its humanitarian work in armed conflicts".

A resolution on the dissemination of humanitarian law and the fundamental principles requests the ICRC and the Federation:

- "— to pursue their efforts, in cooperation with the National Societies, in the field of training of dissemination leaders, in particular through training courses,
- to increase their cooperation with the National Societies for the preparation of suitable teaching material for various publics with due consideration of already-existing material".

All the components of the Movement, and in particular the National Societies, were called upon to organize dissemination programmes geared to young people and to ensure wide dissemination of the "Guidelines for the 90s".

Last but not least, by its resolution entitled "Strategy for Europe", the Conference decided to set up a working group, composed of representatives of six National Societies covering the different parts of the continent, to promote, inspire and monitor efforts towards implementation within individual National Societies and the region as a whole of the Federation's Strategic Work Plan, as updated by the Executive Council at its 29th session (Cordoba, May 1992).

COLUMBUS '92 EXHIBITION

THE ICRC AND THE ITALIAN RED CROSS IN GENOA

A large-scale specialized international exhibition entitled "Christopher Columbus: Ships and the Sea" was held in Genoa from 15 May to 15 August. It had four major themes:

- history (the development of seagoing craft and navigation);
- the present day (ecological, social, economic and cultural aspects of seafaring);
- technology (what the future holds in ship design, navigation systems and seafaring techniques);
- the law of the sea.

● ICRC display

At the invitation of the Italian government and the National Society, the ICRC set up a display covering 200 square metres on the origins and development of international humanitarian law, with special emphasis on the 1949 Geneva Convention for the victims of war at sea. The display, entitled “Protecting Human Life in Wartime: International Humanitarian Law in Naval Conflict”, included not only panel-mounted photographs and models illustrating the theme but also a video that outlined the history of the Second Convention and described the implementation of humanitarian law during the First and Second World Wars, as well as more recent conflicts (the Falklands/Malvinas conflict, the Gulf War, relief supplies for the civilian population of Dubrovnik, etc.).

The ICRC stand was officially opened on 26 May 1992 by President Cornelio Sommaruga, who was received there by Mr. Alberto Bemporad, Commissioner General of the Exhibition, a representative of *Ente Colombo '92* (the official organizing body for the exhibition), and representatives of the Italian Red Cross. The President gave a press conference on the subject of respect for international humanitarian law.

● The Italian Red Cross and the sea

The same day, an exhibition entitled “The Italian Red Cross and the Sea” was opened aboard the *San Marco*, an Italian naval vessel assigned to civil defence operations. The ceremony was attended by Professor Luigi Giannico, Special Commissioner of the Italian Red Cross, Ambassador Remo Paolini, the Society’s Deputy Special Commissioner and its Commissioner General for the exhibition, the ICRC President, dignitaries from the city of Genoa and high-ranking officers of the Italian navy.

A skilfully arranged display of photographs, documents, models and rescue equipment illustrated the activities at sea of the Italian Red Cross during the First and Second World Wars and the relief and repatriation opera-

tions carried out to assist civilians in Korea in 1951 and Vietnamese boat people in 1979, the "Peace Ship" in Africa in 1985 and more recent operations to aid Albanians and victims of the hostilities in Croatia. The exhibition paid fervent tribute to the military corps of the Italian Red Cross, the corps of voluntary nurses, the National Women's Committee, volunteer first-aid workers, the *pionieri* and blood donors.

From 26 to 28 May, the *San Marco* was also the scene of a congress entitled "Nautical Medicine and the Role of the Italian Red Cross". Organized by that Society and the *Società italiana di Medicina del Mare*, it brought together experts to discuss the legal, economic and medical aspects of naval conflicts and accidents at sea, as well as water pollution and its consequences, under-water medicine and medical assistance at sea.

The congress ended with a sea rescue demonstration by Italian Red Cross teams in the port of Genoa.

Other related events also took place, such as a round table on humanitarian law and the ICRC which was held at Genoa's military base on 31 July for officers from all three service branches.

● The Italian Red Cross Museum

This description of these various events would not be complete without mention of the Italian Red Cross Museum. Situated in Campomorone, 30 kilometres from Genoa, the Museum was opened in November 1986. Its displays reflect the Society's activities as they have developed since it was founded. The visitor finds letters, documents, other papers and photos that testify to the work of Henry Dunant, Ferdinando Palasciano and Florence Nightingale — two of Dunant's forerunners in humanitarian endeavour — and the development of the Red Cross in general and the Italian National Society in particular.

Several rooms are devoted to Red Cross work in wartime, with photographs of relief operations from as far back as 1908 to the present time, and illustrations of first-aid posts, field hospitals and the various means of transport used.

The visitor will find his interest aroused by displays showing the technical development of rescue operations in wartime and during natural disasters, as well as equipment used in Italian Red Cross hospitals. The Museum also has on display a series of publications and illustrations on health-care education, most of them drawn up by the Italian Red Cross Youth, and a wide collection of Red Cross stamps issued by the post offices of several countries. Nor does the Museum ignore local history, containing, as it does, documents on Antonio Gavino (1891-1944), founder of the local branch.

At the invitation of Dr. Giuseppe Pittaluga, the Museum's director, President Sommaruga went to Campomorone on 27 May where he was ceremonially greeted by the town's mayor, municipal and provincial authorities and representatives of the Italian Red Cross.

RECOGNITION OF NEW NATIONAL SOCIETIES

- The International Committee of the Red Cross has recognized the *Seychelles Red Cross*. This recognition took effect on 3 June 1992.
- At its meeting on 1 July 1992, the International Committee of the Red Cross confirmed the validity of the recognition of the Russian Red Cross (*Russian Federation*) which was founded in 1867.

The Russian Red Cross (Russian Federation) was part of the Alliance of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies of the USSR between 1924 and 1991. The Alliance was dissolved following the events of December 1991 and its member Societies came back into separate existence.

The recognition of the Seychelles Red Cross and the confirmation of the recognition of the *Red Cross Society of the Russian Federation* bring to **151** the number of National Societies which are members of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.

JOINT COMMISSION OF THE EMPRESS SHÔKEN FUND

CIRCULAR No. 83

Geneva, 11 April 1992

To all National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Seventy-first distribution of income

The Joint Commission entrusted with the distribution of the income of the Empress Shôken Fund met in Geneva on 8 April 1992. The Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Japan in Geneva, His Excellency Mr. Hidetoshi Ukawa, attended the meeting as an observer representing also the Japanese Red Cross Society.

The Commission approved the statement of accounts on the situation of the Fund as at 31 December 1991 and noted that the balance available amounted to 402,987 Swiss francs, and decided to increase it by 18,000 francs corresponding to the amount of an unspent allocation made in 1990 (69th distribution).

In examining the 36 projects presented by 29 National Societies, as well as three regional projects, the Joint Commission took into account the criteria revised and completed in 1990 on the basis of experience gained over the last few years. These criteria are designed to:

- (1) restrict the number of allocations so that the amounts allocated for each are sufficient to enable the approved projects to be successfully implemented;
- (2) give priority to developing Societies and, among them, to those that have least benefited from the Fund or, according to objective criteria, are in greatest need thereby maintaining a reasonable degree of regional balance.

It is thus possible:

- (a) to finance, up to a maximum of half of the funds available, projects to develop the human resources of the candidate Societies (scholarships, training courses benefiting volunteers and paid staff members of both sexes equally);
- (b) to finance, up to a maximum of half of the funds available, purchases of material and equipment clearly corresponding to the objectives of the Fund (Art. 3 of the Regulations), apart from means of transport;
- (c) to restrict allocations earmarked for the purchase of means of transport (vehicles, ambulances, etc.), including spare parts, to half the funds available;
- (d) also to take into consideration one or more projects for a regional programme previously approved by the beneficiary Societies, the International Federation and/or the ICRC. A maximum of 100,000 Swiss francs can be allocated each year, and this for up to five years. Every further allocation is subject to the submission of satisfactory progress reports by the beneficiary Societies;
- (e) to exclude requests from Societies that have not provided satisfactory reports on the use of a previous allocation from the Fund.

The Joint Commission decided to make the following grants:

<i>Beneficiary National Society</i>	<i>Amount in Swiss francs</i>	<i>Purpose of allocation</i>
Afghanistan	72,000	Partial financing for the construction of a dispensary
Bolivia	25,000	Partial financing for the purchase of training and first-aid material
Dominica	20,000	Partial financing for the purchase of a multi-purpose vehicle
Liberia	42,000	Purchase of a Toyota Land Cruiser ambulance
Nepal	54,000	Partial financing of the Society's ambulance service

<i>Beneficiary National Society</i>	<i>Amount in Swiss francs</i>	<i>Purpose of allocation</i>
Paraguay	25,000	Partial financing for the purchase of training and first-aid material
St. Vincent & Grenadines	40,000	Installation of radio equipment to link HQ with the outlying districts
Togo	42,000	Purchase of a Toyota Hiace ambulance
West & Central Africa (Benin, Burkina Faso, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone)	100,000	Cover two-thirds of the Federation's 1992 budget for first-aid training in the region.
Total	420,000	

The unused balance of 987 Swiss francs will be added to the income available for the 72nd distribution (1993).

Depending on market conditions, the Joint Commission will decide whether purchase arrangements will be made by the Federation's Logistics Service or directly by the beneficiary Society.

If a purchase on the local market has been envisaged or decided, the National Society shall submit to the Joint Commission an original offer or *pro forma* invoice, in English, French or Spanish indicating a reliable date of delivery. If applicable, and in accordance with internationally accepted business rules, the Joint Commission will transfer 50% of the indicated price to enable the National Society to place the order. The balance will be transferred only upon receipt of the seller's or manufacturer's delivery form and of the final invoice on which the initial down payment is duly entered.

Pursuant to the Fund's Regulations, each beneficiary Society must submit to the Joint Commission a report on results achieved in using the equipment purchased with the grant. The Joint Commission requests that these descriptive reports be sent not later than twelve months after receiving the allocation, accompanied, if possible, by photographs illustrating the activities carried out thanks to the allocation. The report should show whether the allocation has enabled the Society to implement the programme, and whether the programme

has in fact met the needs of the population, so that the Joint Commission is in a position to form an opinion on results achieved.

The Joint Commission reminds beneficiary Societies of Article 6 of the Regulations which prohibits the assigning of the grant for purposes other than those specified without the prior consent of the Joint Commission.

Allocations remaining unclaimed or unused after twelve months will be withdrawn and added to the amount available for the next distribution.

72nd distribution — 1993

The 1992 income will be distributed in 1993. To help National Societies file their applications in conformity with the Regulations, the Joint Commission will mail model application forms to all National Societies in August. It will also provide National Societies with criteria and guidelines regarding projects that could be financed — wholly or partly — by the Empress Shôken Fund.

Requests for allocations must be submitted to the Secretariat of the Joint Commission before 31 December 1992.

For the Joint Commission

*International Committee
of the Red Cross*

M. Aubert (Chairman)
M. Martin
S. Nessi

*International Federation of
Red Cross and Red Crescent
Societies*

P. Stenbäck
B. Bergman
S. Davey
P. Tischhauser (Secretary)

Russian Federation signs headquarters agreement with ICRC

On 24 June 1992 the government of the Russian Federation and the International Committee of the Red Cross signed a headquarters agreement in Moscow.

Following this agreement the ICRC will open a delegation in the Russian capital to carry out its traditional activities in the country, notably work to spread knowledge of international humanitarian law.

There are already several ICRC delegations in the Caucasus region of the former Soviet Union, in the towns of Baku (Azerbaijan), Yerevan (Armenia) and Tbilisi (Georgia). Following recent events, the ICRC is also present in Vladikavkaz (Ossetia) and Chisinau (Moldova). In addition, a team of delegates has just completed a series of missions to the Central Asian republics.

A headquarters agreement establishes the general framework of the ICRC's relations with the authorities of a country, so that it can work there in accordance with its mandate. The Russian Federation is the 43rd country to sign a headquarters agreement with the ICRC.

Declaration by the Republic of Seychelles

On 22 May 1992 the Republic of Seychelles made the following declaration regarding its recognition of the competence of the International Fact-Finding Commission:

"In accordance with Article 90, paragraph 2(a), of Protocol I additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, the Republic of Seychelles declares that it recognizes *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other High Contracting Party accepting

the same obligation, the competence of the International Fact-Finding Commission to enquire into allegations by such other Party”.

The Republic of Seychelles is the **twenty-ninth State** to make the declaration regarding the Fact-Finding Commission.

The Portuguese Republic ratifies the Protocols

On 27 May 1992, the Portuguese Republic ratified the Protocols additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 and relating to the protection of victims of international (Protocol I) and non-international (Protocol II) armed conflicts, adopted in Geneva on 8 June 1977.

In accordance with their provisions, the Protocols will come into force for the Portuguese Republic on 27 November 1992.

The Portuguese Republic is the **113th State** to become party to Protocol I and the **103rd** to Protocol II.

Declaration of the Standing Commission of the Red Cross and Red Crescent

The Standing Commission, meeting in ordinary session on 25 June 1992,

1. *reaffirms* its commitment to preparing for the 26th International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent,
2. *considers* that, in view of the necessary preparations, the next International Conference could not be convened before 1995,
3. *decides* to create a Working Group chaired by Botho Prince of Sayn-Wittgenstein-Hohenstein and including one representative

from the ICRC and one representative from the Federation, in order:

- to make an in-depth study of all issues related to the International Conference (form, agenda, name, preparation, funding, frequency, preparatory bodies, duration, and so on),
 - to conduct the necessary consultations within the Movement and among States party to the Geneva Conventions, and
 - to report to the Standing Commission at its next meeting.
4. The Standing Commission itself *will submit* a report on this matter to the Council of Delegates in 1993.
 5. The Standing Commission furthermore *encourages* the ICRC to consult with governments and to examine with them what measures might be quickly taken to increase the States' awareness of their responsibilities in order to ensure their respect for international humanitarian law.
 6. The Standing Commission *also encourages* the Federation to consult with National Societies and governments in order to address humanitarian problems within its mandate.
 7. The Standing Commission *requests* the ICRC and the Federation to inform it regularly about the results of their consultations.
-

Books and reviews

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

Under this heading, the *Review* lists recent publications which may interest readers, particularly those engaged in research. Selected works will be reviewed in future issues. Having received a number of requests from readers, we would like to point out that these publications are not on sale at the ICRC but are available for consultation at the ICRC library or at the Henry Dunant Institute.

- **Mohamed Bedjaoui** (editor), *Droit international - Bilan et perspectives*, Pedone, UNESCO, Paris, 2 volumes, 1991, 1,362 + xviii pp.

This is a new kind of handbook of international law which, according to the editor, is multicultural in that it takes into account "the great civilizations" and "the main legal systems throughout the world". The handbook is also an introduction for students and practitioners, a learning tool with a clearly internationalist outlook. The book's aim is to describe international law as it is today, explaining its nature and purpose and pointing out its strengths and weaknesses.

- **Yves Beigbeder**, *The Role and Status of International Humanitarian Volunteers and Organizations - The right and duty of humanitarian assistance*, Martinus Nijhoff, Dordrecht, Boston, London, 1991 (Legal aspects of international organizations, vol. 12), 416 pp.

A detailed analysis of the interplay between the individuals, governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations that go together to make up today's humanitarian network. The author studies problems such as exercising discretion versus revealing the facts, preserving neutrality, avoiding politicization, and the right - and duty - to provide humanitarian assistance vis-à-vis the paramountcy of national sovereignty. The author also deals with the difficulty in balancing the twin imperatives of providing humanitarian assistance for the victims of an existing conflict and respecting the stark reality of national sovereignty.

- **Isse Omanga Bokatola**, *L'Organisation des Nations Unies et la protection des minorités*, Bruylant, Brussels, 292 pp. (Organisation internationale et relations internationales)

The problem of minorities is an extremely serious one; it can undermine the integrity, stability and unity of all the states in the world. In his study of the question, the author looks at solutions of two general kinds, some proposed by the UN, and others practised by member states. Radical solutions tantamount to excluding minorities from society or simply ignoring the problem contrast with compromise solutions aimed at protecting minorities while preserving the territorial integrity of the states. This book also contains a detailed study of the declaration on the rights of minorities currently being prepared by the UN Commission on Human Rights.

- **Antonio Cassese** (editor), *The International Fight Against Torture - La lutte internationale contre la torture*, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden, 1991, 186 pp.

How effective are existing mechanisms to safeguard human dignity against torture and other inhuman or degrading treatment? A group of experts has undertaken to answer the various aspects of this question by examining current legal literature and the practice in the various states and referring to studies of actual cases.

- **La Croix-Rouge et la carrière - Le rôle de la Croix-Rouge suisse dans la formation du personnel soignant (1882-1976)**, (ed. Enrico Valsangiacomo), Schwabe & Co. AG, Bâle, 1991, 440 pp.

This book describes how, in times of change, the Red Cross has kept pace with the needs of medicine and society as a whole and the contribution it has made to developing and serving as a hallmark of quality for a profession which, more than any other, has responded to the various phases of social development.

- **Humanité et droit international - Mélanges René-Jean Dupuy**, Pedone, Paris, 1991, 382 pp.

This work contains a series of articles by experts and scholars on the concept of humanity and how it relates to politics, economics, social issues and the judiciary in contemporary society.

- **B.G. Ramcharan**, *The International Law and Practice of Early-Warning and Preventive Diplomacy: The Emerging Global Watch*, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, London, 1991, 185 pp.

With so many threats to international security (environmental pollution, terrorism, drug trafficking, famine and other large-scale disasters, grave violations of human rights and enormous population movements), the author advocates an integrated strategy to deal with these problems and the setting up of a truly preventive form of diplomacy.

- *Les religions et la guerre - Judaïsme, Christianisme, Islam* (edited by Pierre Viaud), Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1991, 584 pp.

What do religions say about peace and justice? What do they do about it? Do religions polarize people in conflicts or do they help to overcome conflict by exercising a benign influence on individuals and societies? Writing on six different fields, twenty-one theologians from Judaism, Catholicism, the Orthodox Church, Protestantism and Islam explain their religions' precepts on the following subjects: tradition, conventional war, dissuasion, nuclear and other modern weapons, terrorism, undeclared war and, finally, the economic implications of defence. These monotheistic religions lay down codes of peace, fraternity and respect for life that can attenuate the effects of what human hatred seeks to render inevitable.

- **Leon Stubbings**, *Look what you started Henry! - A history of the Australian Red Cross, 1914-1991*, Australian Red Cross, 1992, 316 + x pp.

Leon Stubbings is a leading Red Cross figure, both in Australia and worldwide, who has been awarded the Henry Dunant Medal in recognition of his work. Mr. Stubbings relates the history of the Australian Red Cross Society with special emphasis on the men and women who have worked as its volunteers since it was founded three quarters of a century ago. This personal approach to a history laced with anecdotes and practical examples is a fervent tribute to all those, famous and unsung alike, who have forged the Red Cross.

ADDRESSES OF NATIONAL RED CROSS AND RED CRESCENT SOCIETIES

- AFGHANISTAN (Democratic Republic of) — Afghan Red Crescent Society, Puli Hartan, *Kabul*.
- ALBANIA (Republic of) — Albanian Red Cross, Rue Qamil Guranjaku No. 2, *Tirana*.
- ALGERIA (People's Democratic Republic of) — Algerian Red Crescent, 15 bis, boulevard Mohamed V, *Algiers*.
- ANGOLA — Angola Red Cross, Av. Hoji Ya Henda 107, 2. andar, *Luanda*.
- ARGENTINA — The Argentine Red Cross, H. Yrigoyen 2068, 1089 *Buenos Aires*.
- AUSTRALIA — Australian Red Cross Society, 206, Clarendon Street, *East Melbourne 3002*.
- AUSTRIA — Austrian Red Cross, Wiedner Hauptstrasse 32, Postfach 39, A-1041, *Vienna 4*.
- BAHAMAS — The Bahamas Red Cross Society, P.O. Box N-8331, *Nassau*.
- BAHRAIN — Bahrain Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 882, *Manama*.
- BANGLADESH — Bangladesh Red Crescent Society, 684-686, Bara Magh Bazar, Dhaka-1217, G.P.O. Box No. 579, *Dhaka*.
- BARBADOS — The Barbados Red Cross Society, Red Cross House, Jemmotts Lane, *Bridgetown*.
- BELGIUM — Belgian Red Cross, 98, chaussée de Vleurgat, 1050 *Brussels*.
- BELIZE — Belize Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 413, *Belize City*.
- BENIN (Republic of) — Red Cross of Benin, B.P. No. 1, *Porto-Novo*.
- BOLIVIA — Bolivian Red Cross, Avenida Simón Bolívar, 1515, *La Paz*.
- BOTSWANA — Botswana Red Cross Society, 135 Independence Avenue, P.O. Box 485, *Gaborone*.
- BRAZIL — Brazilian Red Cross, Praça Cruz Vermelha No. 10-12, *Rio de Janeiro*.
- BULGARIA — Bulgarian Red Cross, 1, Boul. Biruzov, 1527 *Sofia*.
- BURKINA FASO — Burkina Be Red Cross Society, B.P. 340, *Ouagadougou*.
- BURUNDI — Burundi Red Cross, rue du Marché 3, P.O. Box 324, *Bujumbura*.
- CAMEROON — Cameroon Red Cross Society, rue Henri-Dunant, P.O. B 631, *Yaoundé*.
- CANADA — The Canadian Red Cross Society, 1800 Alta Vista Drive, *Ottawa*, Ontario K1G 4J5.
- CAPE VERDE (Republic of) — Red Cross of Cape Verde, Rua Unidade-Guiné-Cabo Verde, P.O. Box 119, *Praia*.
- CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC — Central African Red Cross Society, B.P. 1428, *Bangui*.
- CHAD — Red Cross of Chad, B.P. 449, *N' Djamena*.
- CHILE — Chilean Red Cross, Avenida Santa Maria No. 0150, Correo 21, Casilla 246-V., *Santiago de Chile*.
- CHINA (People's Republic of) — Red Cross Society of China, 53, Ganmian Hutong, *Beijing*.
- COLOMBIA — Colombian Red Cross Society, Avenida 68, No. 66-31, Apartado Aéreo 11-10, *Bogotá D.E.*
- CONGO (People's Republic of the) — Congolese Red Cross, place de la Paix, B.P. 4145, *Brazzaville*.
- COSTA RICA — Costa Rica Red Cross, Calle 14, Avenida 8, Apartado 1025, *San José*.
- CÔTE D'IVOIRE — Red Cross Society of Côte d'Ivoire, B.P. 1244, *Abidjan*.
- CUBA — Cuban Red Cross, Calle Prado 206, Colón y Trocadero, *Habana 1*.
- THE CZECH AND SLOVAK FEDERAL REPUBLIC — Czechoslovak Red Cross, Thunovská 18, 118 04 *Prague 1*.
- DENMARK — Danish Red Cross, Dag Hammarskjølds Allé 28, Postboks 2600, 2100 *København Ø*.
- DJIBOUTI — Red Crescent Society of Djibouti, B.P. 8, *Djibouti*.
- DOMINICA — Dominica Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 59, *Roseau*.
- DOMINICAN REPUBLIC — Dominican Red Cross, Apartado postal 1293, *Santo Domingo*.
- ECUADOR — Ecuadorean Red Cross, calle de la Cruz Roja y Avenida Colombia, *Quito*.
- EGYPT (Arab Republic of) — Egyptian Red Crescent Society, 29, El Galaa Street, *Cairo*.
- EL SALVADOR — Salvadorean Red Cross Society, 17C. Pte y Av. Henri Dunant, *San Salvador*, Apartado Postal 2672.
- ETHIOPIA — Ethiopian Red Cross Society, Ras Desta Damtew Avenue, *Addis Ababa*.
- FIJI — Fiji Red Cross Society, 22 Gorrie Street, P.O. Box 569, *Suva*.
- FINLAND — Finnish Red Cross, Tehtaankatu, 1 A. Box 168, 00141 *Helsinki 14/15*.
- FRANCE — French Red Cross, 1, place Henry-Dunant, F-75384 *Paris*, CEDEX 08.
- GAMBIA — The Gambia Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 472, *Banjul*.
- GERMANY — German Red Cross, Friedrich-Erbert-Allee 71, 5300, *Bonn 1*, Postfach 1460 (D.B.R.).
- GHANA — Ghana Red Cross Society, National Headquarters, Ministries Annex A3, P.O. Box 835, *Accra*.
- GREECE — Hellenic Red Cross, rue Lycavittou, 1, *Athens 10672*.
- GRENADA — Grenada Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 221, *St George's*.
- GUATEMALA — Guatemalan Red Cross, 3.^a Calle 8-40, Zona 1, *Ciudad de Guatemala*.
- GUINEA — Red Cross Society of Guinea, P.O. Box 376, *Conakry*.
- GUINEA-BISSAU — Red Cross Society of Guinea-Bissau, rua Justino Lopes N.º 22-B, *Bissau*.
- GUYANA — The Guyana Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 10524, Eve Leary, *Georgetown*.
- HAITI — Haitian National Red Cross Society, place des Nations Unies, (Bicentenaire), B.P. 1337, *Port-au-Prince*.
- HONDURAS — Honduran Red Cross, 7.^a Calle, 1.^a y 2.^a Avenidas, *Comayagüela D.M.*

- HUNGARY (The Republic of) — Hungarian Red Cross, V. Arany János utca, 31, *Budapest 1367*. Mail Add.: *1367 Budapest St. Pf. 121*.
- ICELAND — Icelandic Red Cross, Raudararstigur 18, 105 *Reykjavik*.
- INDIA — Indian Red Cross Society, 1, Red Cross Road, *New Delhi 110001*.
- INDONESIA — Indonesian Red Cross Society, Jl Jend Gatot subroto Kar. 96, Jakarta Selatan 12790, P.O. Box 2009, *Jakarta*.
- IRAN — The Red Crescent Society of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Avenue Ostad Nejatollahi, *Tehran*.
- IRAQ — Iraqi Red Crescent Society, Mu'ari Street, Mansour, *Baghdad*.
- IRELAND — Irish Red Cross Society, 16, Merrion Square, *Dublin 2*.
- ITALY — Italian Red Cross, 12, via Toscana, 00187 *Rome*.
- JAMAICA — The Jamaica Red Cross Society, 76, Arnold Road, *Kingston 5*.
- JAPAN — The Japanese Red Cross Society, 1-3, Shiba-Daimon, I-chome, Minato-Ku, *Tokyo 105*.
- JORDAN — Jordan National Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 10001, *Amman*.
- KENYA — Kenya Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 40712, *Nairobi*.
- KOREA (Democratic People's Republic of) — Red Cross Society of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ryonhwa 1, Central District, *Pyongyang*.
- KOREA (Republic of) — The Republic of Korea National Red Cross, 32-3Ka, Nam San Dong, Choong-Ku, *Seoul 100-043*.
- KUWAIT — Kuwait Red Crescent Society, (P.O. Box 1359 Safat, *Kuwait*.
- LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC — Lao Red Cross, B.P. 650, *Vientiane*.
- LATVIA — Latvian Red Cross Society, 28, Skolas Street, 226 300 *Riga*.
- LEBANON — Lebanese Red Cross, rue Spears, *Beirut*.
- LESOTHO — Lesotho Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 366, *Maseru 100*.
- LIBERIA — Liberian Red Cross Society, National Headquarters, 107 Lynch Street, 1000 *Monrovia 20*, West Africa.
- LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA — Libyan Red Crescent, P.O. Box 541, *Benghazi*.
- LIECHTENSTEIN — Liechtenstein Red Cross, Heilgkreuz, 9490 *Vaduz*.
- LITHUANIA — Lithuanian Red Cross Society, Gedimino Ave 3a, 232 600 *Vilnius*.
- LUXEMBOURG — Luxembourg Red Cross, Parc de la Ville, B.P. 404, *Luxembourg 2*.
- MADAGASCAR — Malagasy Red Cross Society, 1, rue Patrice Lumumba, *Antananarivo*.
- MALAWI — Malawi Red Cross Society, Conforzi Road, P.O. Box 983, *Lilongwe*.
- MALAYSIA — Malaysian Red Crescent Society, JKR 32 Jalan Nipah, off Jalan Ampang, *Kuala Lumpur 55000*.
- MALI — Mali Red Cross, B.P. 280, *Bamako*.
- MAURITANIA — Mauritanian Red Crescent, B.P. 344, avenue Gamal Abdel Nasser, *Nouakchott*.
- MAURITIUS — Mauritius Red Cross Society, Ste Thérèse Street, *Curepipe*.
- MEXICO — Mexican Red Cross, Calle Luis Vives 200, Col. Polanco, *México 10*, Z.P. 11510.
- MONACO — Red Cross of Monaco, 27 boul. de Suisse, *Monte Carlo*.
- MONGOLIA — Red Cross Society of Mongolia, Central Post Office, Post Box 537, *Ulan Bator*.
- MOROCCO — Moroccan Red Crescent, B.P. 189, *Rabat*.
- MOZAMBIQUE — Mozambique Red Cross Society, Caixa Postal 2986, *Maputo*.
- MYANMAR (The Union of) — Myanmar Red Cross Society, 42, Strand Road, *Yangon*.
- NEPAL — Nepal Red Cross Society, Tahachal Kalimati, P.B. 217, *Kathmandu*.
- NETHERLANDS — The Netherlands Red Cross, P.O. Box 28120, 2502 KC *The Hague*.
- NEW ZEALAND — The New Zealand Red Cross Society, Red Cross House, 14 Hill Street, Wellington 1 (P.O. Box 12-140, *Wellington Thorndon*).
- NICARAGUA — Nicaraguan Red Cross, Apartado 3279, *Managua D.N.*
- NIGER — Red Cross Society of Niger, B.P. 11386, *Niamey*.
- NIGERIA — Nigerian Red Cross Society, 11 Eko Akete Close, off St. Gregory's Rd., P.O. Box 764, *Lagos*.
- NORWAY — Norwegian Red Cross, P.O. Box 6875, St. Olavspl. N-0130 *Oslo 1*.
- PAKISTAN — Pakistan Red Crescent Society, National Headquarters, Sector H-8, *Islamabad*.
- PANAMA — Red Cross Society of Panama, Apartado Postal 668, *Panamá 1*.
- PAPUA NEW GUINEA — Papua New Guinea Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 6545, *Boroko*.
- PARAGUAY — Paraguayan Red Cross, Brasil 216, esq. José Berges, *Asunción*.
- PERU — Peruvian Red Cross, Av. Caminos del Inca y Av. Nazarenas, Urb. Las Gardenias — Surco — Lima (33) Apartado 1534, *Lima 100*.
- PHILIPPINES — The Philippine National Red Cross, Bonifacio Drive, Port Area, P.O. Box 280, *Manila 2803*.
- POLAND (The Republic of) — Polish Red Cross, Mokotowska 14, 00-950 *Warsaw*.
- PORTUGAL — Portuguese Red Cross, Jardim 9 Abril, 1 a 5, 1293 *Lisbon*.
- QATAR — Qatar Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 5449, *Doha*.
- ROMANIA — Red Cross of Romania, Strada Biserica Amzei, 29, *Bucarest*.
- RUSSIAN FEDERATION — Red Cross Society of the Russian Federation, Kuznetski Most 18/7, 103031 *Moscow GSP-3*.
- RWANDA — Rwandese Red Cross, B.P. 425, *Kigali*.
- SAINT LUCIA — Saint Lucia Red Cross, P.O. Box 271, *Castries St. Lucia, W. I.*
- SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES — Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 431, *Kingstown*.
- SAN MARINO — Red Cross of San Marino, Comité central, *San Marino*.
- SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE — Sao Tome and Principe Red Cross, C.P. 96, *São Tomé*.
- SAUDI ARABIA — Saudi Arabian Red Crescent Society, *Riyadh 11129*.
- SENEGAL — Senegalese Red Cross Society, Bd Franklin-Roosevelt, P.O.B. 299, *Dakar*.
- SIERRA LEONE — Sierra Leone Red Cross Society, 6, Liverpool Street, P.O.B. 427, *Freetown*.
- SINGAPORE — Singapore Red Cross Society, Red Cross House 15, Penang Lane, *Singapore 0923*.

- SOLOMON ISLANDS — The Solomon Islands Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 187, *Honiara*.
- SOMALIA (Democratic Republic of) — Somali Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 937, *Mogadishu*.
- SOUTH AFRICA — The South African Red Cross Society, Essanby House 6th Floor, 175 Jeppe Street, P.O.B. 8726, *Johannesburg 2000*.
- SPAIN — Spanish Red Cross, Eduardo Dato, 16, *Madrid 28010*.
- SRI LANKA (Dem. Soc. Rep. of) — The Sri Lanka Red Cross Society, 106, Dharmapala Mawatha, *Colombo 7*.
- SUDAN (The Republic of the) — The Sudanese Red Crescent, P.O. Box 235, *Khartoum*.
- SURINAME — Suriname Red Cross, Gravenberchstraat 2, Postbus 2919, *Paramaribo*.
- SWAZILAND — Baphalali Swaziland Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 377, *Mbabane*.
- SWEDEN — Swedish Red Cross, Box 27 316, 102-54 *Stockholm*.
- SWITZERLAND — Swiss Red Cross, Rainmattstrasse 10, B.P. 2699, 3001 *Berne*.
- SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC — Syrian Arab Red Crescent, Bd Mahdi Ben Barake, *Damascus*.
- TANZANIA — Tanzania Red Cross National Society, Upanga Road, P.O.B. 1133, *Dar es Salaam*.
- THAILAND — The Thai Red Cross Society, Paribatra Building, Central Bureau, Rama IV Road, *Bangkok 10330*.
- TOGO — Togolese Red Cross, 51, rue Boko Soga, P.O. Box 655, *Lomé*.
- TONGA — Tonga Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 456, *Nuku' Alofa, South West Pacific*.
- TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO — The Trinidad and Tobago Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 357, *Port of Spain, Trinidad, West Indies*.
- TUNISIA — Tunisian Red Crescent, 19, rue d'Angleterre, *Tunis 1000*.
- TURKEY — The Turkish Red Crescent Society, Genel Baskanligi, Karanfil Sokak No. 7, 06650 *Kizilay-Ankara*.
- UGANDA — The Uganda Red Cross Society, Plot 97, Buganda Road, P.O. Box 494, *Kampala*.
- UNITED ARAB EMIRATES — The Red Crescent Society of the United Arab Emirates, P.O. Box No. 3324, *Abu Dhabi*.
- UNITED KINGDOM — The British Red Cross Society, 9, Grosvenor Crescent, *London, S.W.1X. 7EJ*.
- USA — American Red Cross, 17th and D Streets, N.W., *Washington, D.C. 20006*.
- URUGUAY — Uruguayan Red Cross, Avenida 8 de Octubre 2990, *Montevideo*.
- U.S.S.R. — The Alliance of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies of the U.S.S.R., I, Tcheremushkinskii proezd 5, *Moscow, 117036*.
- VENEZUELA — Venezuelan Red Cross, Avenida Andrés Bello, N.º 4, Apartado, 3185, *Caracas 1010*.
- VIET NAM (Socialist Republic of) — Red Cross of Viet Nam, 68, rue Ba-Triêu, *Hanoi*.
- WESTERN SAMOA — Western Samoa Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 1616, *Apia*.
- YEMEN (Republic of) — Yemeni Red Crescent Society, P.O. Box 1257, *Sana'a*.
- YUGOSLAVIA — Red Cross of Yugoslavia, Simina ulica broj 19, 11000 *Belgrade*.
- ZAIRE — Red Cross Society of the Republic of Zaire, 41, av. de la Justice, Zone de la Gombe, B.P. 1712, *Kinshasa*.
- ZAMBIA — Zambia Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 50 001, 2837 Saddam Hussein Boulevard, Longacres, *Lusaka*.
- ZIMBABWE — The Zimbabwe Red Cross Society, P.O. Box 1406, *Harare*.

**READ AND ENCOURAGE OTHERS TO READ
THE INTERNATIONAL REVIEW
OF THE RED CROSS**

Help increase its circulation

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

I should like to subscribe to the *International Review of the Red Cross* for 1 year from (date)

☐ English

☐ Spanish

☐ French

☐ Arabic

☐ German (selected articles)

Name

First name

Organization

Profession ou function

Address

Country

Please cut out or photocopy and mail to:

International Review of the Red Cross
19, av. de la Paix
CH-1202 Geneva

English, French, Spanish and Arabic editions:

1-year subscription (6 issues): Sw. frs. 30 or US\$ 18.
(single copy Sw. frs. 5)

German edition:

1-year subscription (6 issues): Sw. frs. 10 or US\$ 6.
(single copy Sw. frs. 2)

Postal cheque account No. 12-1767-1 Geneva

Bank account No. 129.986.0, Swiss Bank Corporation, Geneva

Specimen copy on request

Date

Signature

The *International Review of the Red Cross* is the official publication of the International Committee of the Red Cross. It was first published in 1869 under the title "Bulletin international des Sociétés de secours aux militaires blessés", and then "Bulletin international des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge".

The *International Review of the Red Cross* is a forum for reflection and comment and serves as a reference work on the mission and guiding principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. It is also a specialized journal in the field of international humanitarian law and other aspects of humanitarian endeavour.

As a chronicle of the international activities of the Movement and a record of events, the *International Review of the Red Cross* is a constant source of information and maintains a link between the components of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.

The *International Review of the Red Cross* is published every two months, in four main editions:

French: REVUE INTERNATIONALE DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (since October 1869)

English: INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF THE RED CROSS (since April 1961)

Spanish: REVISTA INTERNACIONAL DE LA CRUZ ROJA (since January 1976)

Arabic: المجلة الدولية للصليب الأحمر

(since May-June 1988)

Selected articles from the main editions have also been published in German under the title *Auszüge* since January 1950.

EDITOR: Jacques Meurant, D. Pol. Sci.

ADDRESS: International Review of the Red Cross
19, avenue de la Paix
1202 - Geneva, Switzerland

SUBSCRIPTIONS: one year, 30 Swiss francs or US\$ 18
single copy, 5 Swiss francs

Postal cheque account No. 12 - 1767-1 Geneva

Bank account No. 129.986.0, Swiss Bank Corporation, Geneva

The *International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)* and the *International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies*, together with the *National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies*, form the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.

The *ICRC*, which gave rise to the Movement, is an independent humanitarian institution. As a neutral intermediary in the event of armed conflict or unrest it endeavours, on its own initiative or on the basis of the Geneva Conventions, to bring protection and assistance to the victims of international and non-international armed conflict and internal disturbances and tension.

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW

MORE ABOUT THE EMBLEM

Unity and plurality of the emblems

**Regulations on the use of the emblem
of the red cross or the red crescent
by the National Societies**

HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

New points of view

Florence Nightingale Medal